MINUTES OF MEETING PLANNING COMMISSION JUNE 17, 2025

Members Present: Coyne, Allen, DeMarco, Bishop

Presence Noted: Ray Reich, Building Commissioner

Kathryn Kerber, Director of Planning and Community Development Dylan Minek, Planning and Community Development Administrator

Council Members Present: Michael O'Boyle, Ward 2

Chairman Bishop called to order the June 17, 2025, meeting of the Rocky River Planning Commission at 6:00 P.M. in City Council Chambers of Rocky River City Hall.

Mr. Bishop asked if there were any corrections to the Planning Commission meeting minutes of May 20, 2025. Mr. DeMarco moved to accept the minutes as written. Mr. Allen seconded.

4 Ayes – 0 Nays Passed

1. Gregg Mylett – 1223-1239 Allen Ct – Public Hearing: Preliminary Review – Demolish existing homes, and add gardens to vacant lots

Present: Richard J. Piccola, Architect

Mr. Piccola said Mr. Mylett's purpose is to beautify the street by tearing down the homes that have become neglected. He wants to put some landscaping in and then fence some of the yard until he figures out how he would like to use the property. Mr. Piccola said once that it is determined he will bring that in front of the Board regarding that. Mr. Bishop asked if Mr. Piccola would consider this temporary. Mr. Piccola said that this will be up until the next use is determined. With the uncertainty of the road behind these properties, he wants to have garden space to make the neighborhood look good in the meantime. Mr. Bishop asked if it would be opened to other people. Mr. Piccola said it would not be open to anyone other than Mr. Mylett and his family. Mr. Bishop asked what the purpose of the crushed gravel is. Mr. Piccola said that it is for Mr. Mylett so he can access all the properties from the property he owns to the north of this. Mr. Bishop asked what the purpose of the fenced-in grass is. Mr. Piccola said Mr. Mylett is currently working with some consultants to plant landscaping that will support butterflies, bees, and hummingbirds. Once the consultants come up with a plan on how to use the inside of the fence, they will come forward with what the institution will become. Mr. Bishop said the fence does not comply with the code.

Mr. Bishop said that this is not a permitted or conditional use, and he cannot find anything in the code relating to a similar use. However, since Mr. Mylett is only using this for himself and his family and not for any other use, Mr. Bishop is not sure any of that would apply. If it is just for his family, there is no requirement for parking. If he used it for anyone other than his family, then it would become a problem and require off-street parking. Mr. Bishop asked what the need was for the fence immediately. Mr. Piccola said the properties were multi-family before and may become multi-family again. Building the fences in the rear means he could add multi-family housing again without having to remove or move the fence later. Mr. Bishop said that he does not see a need for the fence, and the fence type does not comply with the code. Mr. Piccola would like clarification on why the type of fence would not comply. He said the code allows for

Minutes of Meeting Planning Commission June 17, 2025 Page 2 of 10

iron and finished wood, which he said is essentially what this fence is. Mr. Reich and Mr. Bishop said this fence looks like chicken wire; this is not a permitted style of fence.

Mr. Demarco said there is a big unknown right now around the potential use of the properties. So, essentially what they are reviewing is a garden. Mr. Demarco said to him, the fence seems unnecessary right now, but he is allowed to install a fence as long as it complies with the code. Mr. Allen would agree, they have reviewed this property a couple of times now for a particular use, and now there is no use. Mr. Coyne said he thinks they are all confused since there is no specific use anymore. Mr. Bishop said he thinks there is a concern because last month it was on the table for bee hives, and they were going to be fenced in. Now there is a fenced-in area with no beehives. Mr. Piccola said that is who he is consulting with, a specific institution to run it. Mr. Mylett has to get the landscaping healthy before they can look at the property, so it will be next spring before that. When that time comes, he will come in with plans and the consultants to present on the beehives.

Mr. Bishop said that if they take the fence out of the plans, it removes the issue of the type of fence. When he comes back, he can include the fence and show what that intent is inside the fence. He could just do the grass for now, Mr. Bishop asked if he thinks that would be acceptable. Mr. Piccola said no. Mr. Reich agreed with Mr. Bishop that the fence clearly shows intent.

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

4 Ayes – 0 Nays Passed

Present: Ron Laurie, 1240 Allen Ct.

Mr. Laurie asked if the Marion Ramp is coming down. He wants to know what is going to happen to his property if it does. Mr. Bishop said it is out of the realm and does not relate to this property. Mr. Laurie said that they will try to buy up the street and put condos on the street. Mr. Bishop said there has been talk about taking the Marion Ramp down for 20 years. Mr. Reich said there are no plans in place.

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

4 Ayes – 0 Nays Passed

Mr. Bishop said landscaping of the fence would be required, and he would need to go to the Design and Construction Board of Review with the fence and landscaping plan. The fence needs to comply with the code. After the Design and Construction Board of Review, he would have to come back for final review through the Planning Commission.

Mr. Bishop moved to grant preliminary approval, conditioned on Design Board approval, landscape plan, and that the fenced-in area remains grass, or it is to be brought back for review. Mr. Demarco seconded

Minutes of Meeting Planning Commission June 17, 2025 Page 3 of 10

4 Ayes – 0 Nays Passed

2. Cleveland Yachting Club – 200 Yacht Club Dr – Public Hearing: Preliminary Review – New gas dock building and entry drive improvements

Present: Jim Wallis, Perspectus Architecture Jon McCollister, Civil Engineer

Mr. Bishop asked the rest of the members if the consensus is to handle the two projects separately, since it is the first time they will be seeing the entry drive improvements. The rest of the members agreed. They will discuss and vote on them separately.

Mr. Bishop moved to modify the agenda to two separate items, one for the gas dock and one for the guardhouse. Mr. Demarco seconded.

4 Ayes – 0 Nays Passed

Mr. Bishop said to start with the gas dock building since it was discussed at last month's meeting. Mr. Wallis said they submitted the updated drawings, renderings, and photos of the building. They have got approval from the client regarding the materials, and they will be matching the existing clubhouse. Except that one portion of the gas dock building will have a green roof to highlight that section of the building. Mr. Bishop said the landscaping plan looks good. Mr. Demarco asked what the hours of operation will be for the building. Mr. Wallis would assume the same hours as the Cleveland Yachting Club's hours, which would be no different than what it is currently. Mr. Demarco said the site plan shows retail space, and he is wondering what things might be sold there. Mr. Wallis said it would include coolers, beverages, snacks, boat products, and merchandise. Mr. Demarco asked if the few parking spaces to the south would be used for members who are coming in without their boats. Mr. Wallis confirmed that those few parking spaces were intended for that.

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. Allen seconded.

4 Ayes – 0 Nays Passed

Mr. Bishop moved to grant preliminary approval to the Cleveland Yachting Club, 200 Yacht Club Dr, for the construction of a gas dock building. Mr. Demarco seconded.

Minutes of Meeting Planning Commission June 17, 2025 Page 4 of 10

Passed

Mr. Wallis said right now, there is only one entry drive into the Club. Their idea now is to create two entrances, one for members and one for visitors, to speed up traffic. Mr. Wallis said to do that, they have to remove the existing guardhouse and build a new one. They will use the same materials that are used on the clubhouse and the gas dock building. They will also add brick pavers at the entrance. Trying to improve the overall appearance of the club and keep consistent with the clubhouse and the rest of the buildings. Mr. Bishop said the landscaping plan is a little lacking. Mr. Wallis said they owe them that for the next submission. Mr. Demarco asked what the phasing would be for the construction of the two buildings. Mr. Wallis said the idea is to do it at the same time because they would like to use the same contractor for both buildings. Their thought is to start the gas dock building in October.

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. Allen seconded.

4 Ayes – 0 Nays Passed

Mr. Demarco moved to grant preliminary approval to the Cleveland Yachting Club, 200 Yacht Club Dr, for new entry drive and guardhouse improvements. Mr. Allen seconded.

4 Ayes – 0 Nays Passed

3. City of Rocky River – 21012 Hilliard Blvd – Public Hearing: Preliminary Review – Fire station renovation

Present: David Urbansky, Perspectus Architecture Aaron Lenart, Fire Chief

Mr. Urbansky said they are going to take down the existing 4-bay fire station and replace it with a 6-bay fire station. There will be new apron work in front of the bays, but will not extend out to the street. The materials will match the recently renovated police station. Mr. Urbansky said they have included the landscaping plan and lighting plan as requested in the previous meeting. Mr. Bishop said the windows on the fire station do not match the size and scale of the windows on the police station. Mr. Demarco said he understands what Mr. Bishop is saying, but thinks they are different from a functional standpoint; he wasn't concerned about the differences. Mr. Bishop said the landscaping plan was very nice, and the lighting schematic had everything that was needed. Mr. Allen asked about the entryway, the police station goes to three stories, and the fire station only goes to two. Is there any thought to keep it consistent? Mr. Lenart said they will raise it to match the police station. Mayor Bobst is adamant about keeping the two sides as consistent as functionally possible.

Minutes of Meeting Planning Commission June 17, 2025 Page 5 of 10

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

4 Ayes – 0 Nays Passed

Present: Katherine Mzik, 1948 Wagar Rd.

Mrs. Mzik is the first house north of the city hall campus. She is concerned about the screening between the fire station and the senior center and her property. Mr. Reich said he will send her a copy of the meeting minutes from when the senior center was reviewed. Her concern with screening does not necessarily pertain to the fire station, but more with the senior center, and Mr. Reich will make sure she has the necessary information. Another concern she has is the runoff and drainage in the area. As the city hall campus continues to add more concrete and bigger buildings, the water has nowhere to go. She just lost a tree to root rot because part of her yard has been flooding. Mr. Bishop said he remembered that in their review of the senior center, there would be catch basins on the north and east sides. The city engineer should have reviewed that, and maybe in the construction of the senior center, they are not that far along yet. Mr. Bishop said there is quite some distance from her house to the fire station, and all the runoff from the fire station should be confined to that project area and not affect her. The third question she had was about the generator relocation. Right now, it is shielded on three sides by buildings, so she does not hear the generator. Mr. Mzik's concern is that she will be able to hear it since it won't be shielded as well and is going closer to her property. Mr. Reich said that where it is now is not functional, there is not enough space to service it, so it has to move. Mr. Reich said there are decibel readings they have to do at the property lines, and they have to honor that. Mr. Mzik wondered when the project would start and how long it would take. Mr. Lenart said the plan is to start this fall, with a 14-16 month construction timeline. There will be a slim overlap between this and the senior center.

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

4 Ayes – 0 Nays Passed

Mr. Bishop said this will need to go to the Design and Construction Board of Review before final approval can be granted.

Mr. Demarco moved to grant preliminary approval to the City of Rocky River, 21012 Hilliard Blvd, for a new fire station. Mr. Allen seconded.

4 Ayes – 0 Nays Passed

4. The Foundry at Rocky River – 20325 Center Ridge Rd – Public Hearing: Preliminary Review – Change of use from office to multi-family residential/ multi-family redevelopment

Minutes of Meeting Planning Commission June 17, 2025 Page 6 of 10

Present: Garrett Allen, Walter Haverfield Scott Wallenhort, HEART Design Group

Mr. Bishop said the parking is in compliance, but if any of the future spaces are leased, a new parking calculation will have to be determined based on whatever that use is. Mr. Bishop said there are 10% of studios, but only one of them is over 600 square feet. Mr. Wallenhort asked if he could speak about that. Mr. Bishop said they have been pretty adamant on keeping the studios over 600 square feet because the code doesn't even allow studios, but the new code will at 10% and over 600 square feet. So, they would be in support of a variance for the 10% studios only if they are over 600 square feet. Mr. Bishop said there are 64 one-bedroom apartments, and 18 of them are below the 750 square feet requirement. Mr. Bishop said they could ask for a variance for the one bedrooms, but personally, he would not support it. Mr. Wallenhort said they are working within the limits of an existing building, and they are trying to meet the code requirements while also maintaining the design requirements and keeping the number of units high. They have lost 5 units since the last time they came in front of the Commission. Mr. Bishop said he understands the constraints that they are working with, but the previous approval was able to achieve these requirements. Mr. Wallenhort said he went through and calculated the units of the previous submission, and they did not comply with the code; whether their drawings didn't reflect that, he is not sure. Mr. Bishop said the landscaping is basically where it needs to be. Mr. Bishop asked if the pages could be numbered so that when they talk about them, they can refer to the page. Mr. Bishop said the site plan is not what they consider a site plan; typically, they have a survey showing the parking spaces and dimensions, the drive aisle width, and setbacks. Mr. Bishop asked Mr. Reich if he could look at the handicap parking. Mr. Reich said he would have to make a calculation. Mr. Bishop said there needs to be hatching that is next to the handicap spaces when required, and that should be on the site plan. Mr. Wallenhort said that it was included, but maybe it was printed lightly; he can include it darker next time. Mr. Bishop said their storage spaces for the units are too small. Mr. Wallenhort was following the previous submission, calculating the storage area in cubic terms, and it should be calculated by square footage. The labeling on the plans needs to be larger and more pronounced because it is hard to read. Mr. Demarco said he likes the garage plan, but could they do a floor plan of the lower level at the same scale as the other floors in the building? Mr. Bishop asked if they could see all four sides of the building elevation with color renderings and label them as north, south, east, and west.

Mr. Wallenhorst said they have updated elevations that incorporated Mr. Coyne's comments from the last meeting about something decorative on the exterior in front of the louvres. That would include running mesh, exposed metal screening up the sides of the buildings to hide the louvres. Mr. Demarco asked if they could look into putting them on all sides of the building to keep it consistent. Mr. Wallenhorst said they can look into that. His thought would be to put them down the middle post, but maybe not as thick as what is on the side. Mr. Wallenhorst said the material would be aluminum. Mr. Demarco said the porte-cocheres are painted black in the renderings, and he likes them dark rather than the building color.

Mr. David Allen asked what the color of the louvres was behind the screening. Mr. Wallenhorst said the color would match the color of the building as closely as possible, to not draw too much attention. Mr. David Allen said his only comments would be about the studios and the sizes of the units. 18 out of 64 of the one bedrooms and 9 out of 10 for the studios, he believes they have

Minutes of Meeting Planning Commission June 17, 2025 Page 7 of 10

been pretty consistent with their comments and holding people accountable to those requirements. Mr. Bishop said he understands their dilemma. Mr. Wallenhorst said he has been moving the units around, playing with the calculations, and has tried his best to get the units as close as possible. Shifting the units around and trying to prevent walls from running into windows does not translate into bigger units; you take space from one unit and give it to another, so there are still some that are too small. Mr. Bishop and Mr. David Allen said they are less concerned about the one bedrooms than the studios.

Mr. Bishop said that one project had a variance for storage, and they were renting out the storage units as an addition to the base rent. So, their variance was 50% of what was required. The commission considered the square footage of the unit when giving their support for the variance. Mr. Bishop said if they were willing to dedicate the 90 square feet in the base lease for the studios, that would alleviate some concern in that square footage. Mr. Garrett Allen said the trend in the apartment market is smaller units with shared amenity spaces that are included in the base rent, shared workspaces, shared event spaces, etc. Mr. Bishop said that is something they could consider, but they have not been identified in these plans.

Mr. Wallenhorst said they could allocate storage for the two bedrooms, but maybe it's half of what is required. So maybe the studios could get an extra 45 square feet, plus the 90 square feet. He said he is open to creative solutions to address these concerns. Mr. Bishop asked if that is conditioned space in the garage level. Mr. Wallenhorst said it is. Mr. Wallenhorst said they had also thought of putting space in the unconditioned part that is for bikes, but they didn't want to lose parking spaces. Mr. Demarco likes the idea of that, but they would have to defend that position and say how they are going to accomplish that. Mr. Coyne asked if there is any idea of what the 6,000 square feet of future space will be used for. Mr. Wallenhorst said he has no idea what that space will be used for, and that is for ownership to determine.

Mr. Bishop said all of the design details need to be worked out before the Design and Construction Board of Review. Typically, they would get the variances before the final review. Mr. Bishop asked the other members if they would like to see the storage worked out before they go for a variance. The Design and Construction Board of Review meeting is on July 7th, and the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals meeting is on July 10th.

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

4 Ayes – 0 Nays Passed

Present: David Nieding, Saxton House Rosemary Miller, Saxton House Radu Bartan, Saxton House

Mr. Nieding asked if they will do renovations to the parking lot and basement, and when the start date will be for that. He is wondering if the grading of the parking lot will be considered because when it rains heavily, it can run off the property. Mr. Nieding said that he had heard rumors and is not sure if it's true, but the basement use to flood. Mr. Reich said there is some truth to that, and structural issues in the basement, both of which will be addressed when the renovations

Minutes of Meeting Planning Commission June 17, 2025 Page 8 of 10

occur. Mr. Nieding asked if it would be rentals or condos. Mr. Bishop said it will be rentals. The start date will be dependent on when they get approval; they had previously stated a 16-month construction timeframe. Mr. Bishop said they are doing a full renovation, and the only thing that is being salvaged is the outside shell of the building. They will be adding new landscaping around the building and the parking lot.

Mrs. Miller said there is debris that comes onto the wall that separates the two properties. She is wondering where the dumpsters would be. Mrs. Miller asked about the concrete in the front, where the garage doors are, and the concrete planters. What are their plans concerning that? They will remove the concrete planters and add plantings along the property and in the front of the property. The dumpsters for the building would be in the garage of the building and would not be in the parking lot. Mr. Reich asked if there was debris currently on the wall between the two buildings. Mrs. Miller said there is. Mr. Reich said that Mr. Pintus has been making an effort to clean this building up, so he will make sure that is taken care of.

Mr. Bartan was going to ask about the debris as well. Mr. Bartan said that since there will be dumpsters there for the demolition, could they be on the side of the building that does not face Saxton House? Mr. Garrett Allen said that with a project of this size, they will phase around the building. They will follow the requirements the city has for dumpsters and make sure to minimize the impact as much as possible on the Saxton House. Mr. Bartan asked if there are any issues they may have, whom should they contact? Mr. Reich said to contact the Building Department, and they can contact the construction team. It's important to contact the Building Department so there is documentation of the complaint. Mr. Bartan asked about the wear and tear it could have on Linden Road. Mr. Bishop said they have a right to use the street, and the streets are designed to maintain this type of wear and tear. Mr. Bartan asked if there is any concern about the potential traffic that could happen, especially at the intersection of Linden and Center Ridge. Mr. Bishop said the office building probably generated more traffic than this apartment building will. A 98-unit apartment building does not generate that much traffic. Mrs. Kerber said if it becomes an issue, the city could do a traffic study on that intersection. Mr. Bartan asked what is the time estimate for approval. Mr. Bishop said they have a good chance of getting approved in July, but that is not cut and dry. Mr. Bartan said the noise is also a concern for the residents. Mr. Garrett Allen said the work hours of the project will comply with the city code, which is 7 am-9 pm Monday-Saturday. No Sundays and no holidays.

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

4 Ayes – 0 Nays Passed

Mr. Bishop suggests that the Board table this item, and they meet with the Design and Construction Board of Review and the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals before approval. Mr. Wallenhorst asked to run through the variances they would be requesting just to make sure they are on the same page. Mr. Bishop said that if they can get storage allocated to units that are lacking the required square footage, and then show the additional storage lockers that would be available for the other one and two bedrooms. So, they know the total count of storage units, and most likely, with a condition on the ones that are lacking square footage, automatically get that storage unit allocated to their unit. There is a required 90 square feet for the storage units, and

Minutes of Meeting Planning Commission June 17, 2025 Page 9 of 10

whatever square feet they are short on, they need that additional square footage in storage space. Essentially, for the studios, they need 690 square feet for the studios and 840 square feet for the one bedrooms.

Mr. Demarco asked if they could have a special meeting next week for the Planning Commission. Then go to the Design and Construction Board of Review and the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals. Then, do their final review through the Planning Commission on the normal meeting date of July 15th. Mr. Wallenhorst said the big things that need to be addressed by next week would be the additional storage, the ALTA survey, and a cleaned-up site plan with clear labels. Mr. Demarco said the storage would be 90 square feet per unit, and then additional storage for the studios that are below the square footage requirements. Mr. Bishop asked what the space is in the basement that is not accounted for. Mr. Wallenhorst said it is a future amenity space. Mr. Demarco said his thought would be to annex the basement space for additional storage and create the space on the first floor that is unused as amenity space for the residents.

Mr. Bishop said the studios need to have storage assigned to them. The studios and storage combined should be 690 square feet. Correlate the storage and the unit number. For the other units, the storage can be separate from the lease, and people can rent those if they choose to. Which is an argument to make for the variance, that not everyone is going to rent a storage unit, so not every unit needs a storage area.

Mr. Demarco wanted to confirm what they needed to achieve. For units that are smaller than what is required by code, it's the 90 square feet plus the difference between what is required and what is provided. 27 units are below the size requirement. 71 units meet the size requirements. Mr. Bishop said that for those 71 units, only half of them would be required to have the 90 square feet of storage. The rest of the members agreed.

Mr. Bishop moved to table 20325 Center Ridge Rd for the Foundry. Mr. David Allen seconded.

4 Ayes – 0 Nays Passed

5. Planning Commission

1. Discuss DORAs, Designated Outdoor Refreshment Areas

Mr. Bishop said it is hard to talk about without Mr. O'Shea there. Mr. Allen said, based on his research, it doesn't look like there is anything the Planning Commission needs to do. It probably goes through the services director. The services director would make a recommendation to the council for an ordinance. The city manager would file an application, and items need to be filed with the state. Mr. Allen said it doesn't seem like it's anything for the Planning Commission to do. Mr. Demarco asked if council would make a district for it, and can it could be confined to a specific geographic area. Mr. Allen said that is part of the requirement through the state on what that area is. It should be sponsored by the council, and one of the council members could sponsor the ordinance. Mr. Allen said the requirements go through the signage, the boundary, etc. The council would need to hold a public hearing for DORAs.

Minutes of Meeting Planning Commission June 17, 2025 Page 10 of 10

2. Updating the development code

Mrs. Kerber said she shared her updates with Mr. Bishop and would like to know when he is available to come in to discuss them. They set up a meeting date of June 25th. They will go through both of their versions of the code and go over the notes that they have. Mrs. Kerber said she will also be meeting with the Design and Construction Board of Review to go over the new design guidelines to get their input.

The meeting adjourned at 8:15 pm.

William Bishop, Chairman

Date: 8 19 25