

STOW PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Stow Planning Commission meeting held on Tuesday, March 26, 2015 at 6:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Brauer, Mr. Kohlmeier (arrived at 6:04 p.m.), Mr. Sprungle, Ms. Taylor

MEMBERS ABSENT: Mr. Mihelick

ALSO PRESENT: Director of Planning Rob Kurtz
Planning Commission Secretary Pamela Daerr
Councilman Bob Adaska

PRESS REPRESENTATIVE: Stow Sentry

Mr. Brauer called the meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 6:01 p.m. and asked the audience to stand and say the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mr. Sprungle moved and Ms. Taylor seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the April 28, 2015 meeting. The minutes were approved as submitted.

BUSINESS ITEMS:

P.C. 2015-010: DAVANG PATEL - HOME2 SUITES BY HILTON HOTEL; BRIDGEWATER PARKWAY

Mr. Bobby Johnston and Mr. David Mann of Mann Architects were present to represent the item and were sworn in.

Mr. Kurtz: This is further consideration of a request by Mr. Bobby Johnston of Mann Architects, applicant and Mr. Davang Patel of Shree Dav Partnership, LLC, property owners, for the Planning Commission's approval of a site plan with variances to permit the construction of a 4-story hotel on the east side of Bridgewater Parkway. The property is zoned C-5 Highway Services and hotels are permitted by right in this district.

The proposed Home2 Suites hotel will be 4 stories in height (48 feet) with a building "footprint" of approximately 13,871 square feet and a total area of 50,800 square feet in the proposed structure.

The exterior of the Home2 Suites building will be finished primarily with brick and a cement fiberboard material, and the first level finished with a smooth finish stone material. A small percentage of the proposed structure will be accented with a textured EIFS material.

The lot will be accessed from two curb cuts off of Bridgewater Parkway.

The applicant is requesting the following variances:

1. 1181.10(a) – Providing parking spaces 9 feet in width (Min. 10 feet)
2. 1145.08 – Building height of 48 feet for Home2 hotel (Max. 35 feet)
3. 1145.06 – Front building setback of 70 feet for Home2 hotel (Min. 80 feet)
4. 1145.06 – Side building setback of 12 feet for Home2 hotel (Min. 20 feet)

The proposal before you has 4 variances which is a reduction from the original proposal. I will go through them. Some of them we have discussed in detail and there seems to be a consensus and some were still under question.

In terms of those that seemed to be justified were numbers 2 and 3.

2. In terms of the building height of 48 feet where 35 feet is the maximum. This is a variance that has been granted to other hotels.

3. In terms of the proposed setback from Bridgewater Parkway of 70 feet where 80 feet is required, there are several buildings that are significantly less than 80 feet. Bridgewater Parkway was originally designed as a private street and it was renovated and dedicated as a public right-of-way.

The other two variances, number 4 the side building setback which was previously requested at 10 feet has increased to 12 feet. So the variance request has been reduced from 10 feet to 8 feet. They have also added landscaping and a screen wall on the north side.

The other variance we discussed in detail was number 1 the parking space requirements. As you note Stow's code requires 10 feet. We have granted variances in the past for 9.5 feet in the case of the Courtyard by Marriott and other cases where there is employee parking.

I also distributed to Planning Commission a sampling of other cities. Fifteen cities were sampled and nine required 9 feet. Several cities still had 10 but of the 15 I looked at including Stow there were slightly more that permitted 9 foot wide parking spaces compared to 10 feet. Maybe that is something Planning Commission can consider.

The height requirement, not specific to this application but in general, is something we may want to consider possibly raising in this district given the request for the hotels in this area and maybe parking spaces. It would not be unusual compared to other cities.

Mr. Brauer: Where is staff's position at this point?

Mr. Kurtz: We would support the variance items 2 and 3 in terms of the building height and front setback. In terms of the side building setback it is adjacent to the parking lot and dumpster enclose for the child daycare center. They've also added some additional screening, it's a commercial area and staff could support that. In terms of the parking space I would support that only if the Planning Commission would consider changing that code across the board. It is hard to justify it just for this hotel.

Mr. Johnston: We are picking up where we left off at the previous meeting. We moved the building south another 2 feet because I know half the variance was one of the issues.

While also moving the building south 2 feet we adjusted the parking space on the entire site. We moved it another 6 feet to open that "one way" to pass Stow's code of 24 foot. We went from 18 foot to 24 foot to eliminate that variance. Originally we came in asking for six variances for this north hotel. Now we are asking for 4. We have already somewhat agreed upon 2 of them since other buildings on this site have already received them.

So the biggest concern I believe is the north property and how it abuts against the day care. So this is (pointing to the screen) overall first floor with the landscaping to give you an idea of how this hotel is going to look and how it fits on the site.

The big issue is this first floor chunk that's sticking out of the building. It's only a first floor it's not the entire four stories. What we did going back to the drawing board is we added a 5 foot tall masonry wall, fully enclosed this patio and this patio (pointing to the screen). It will have an egress gate for egress purposes only while also providing more landscaping along the north and a buffer all the way along the north side to separate the daycare parking lot and the daycare from this hotel. Again this is a one-story building.

Looking at this view (pointing at the screen) of the northeast corner, we're standing from where the daycare playground would be. As you can see the patio is fully enclosed with that five foot retaining wall; this part set back (pointing to the screen). It's not where we are asking for the variance, it's actually this one-story area right here (pointing to the screen). We've moved the building 2 feet further and provided a lot more landscape buffer to separate those two pieces.

Mr. Sprungle: Have you calculated room here (pointing to the screen) to the property line where that would be?

Mr. Johnston: Yes, from the corner of the one-story to the corner of the daycare is 34 foot 6 inches. From this recess in where the four-story is (pointing to the screen) back is 56 foot 6 inches. From this corner here (pointing to the screen), that's another 6 feet so we would be at 50 feet to the daycare.

Mr. Sprungle: What about from here (pointing to the screen) to the edge of the property?

Mr. Johnston: Here's our 20 foot setback line (pointing to the screen).

Mr. Sprungle: Got it, I see it.

Mr. Brauer: Are we adequate on handicap parking?

Mr. Johnston: Yes, we are required 4 handicap spaces with 3 of them being standard and 1 of them being a van, which we provide right here (pointing to the screen).

The second part was the 9 foot parking spaces in lieu of 10 foot. As we discussed previously the Courtyard was approved at 9.5 feet. They've probably restriped a few times and we verified they are around 9 foot now.

We are asking for a hotel which is not a shopping center. You come, you park, you go inside, you stay the night, and you leave the next morning. You are not going to be going every 30 minutes to and from. You are going to park your car and stay the night.

Again it's going to be more family oriented. Somebody is going to book two rooms. Families book two rooms, one gets a king and the kids get the double queen. So that is two rooms that are taken but two parking spaces are still required. We have to have one parking space per room plus one for every employee.

We do provide enough parking spaces with the nine foot however if we go to the 10 foot which is required we would not be able to have enough parking spaces. That was the reasoning for going to 9 foot.

Mr. Kohlmeier: Do you know the number of spaces at 9.5 feet?

Mr. Johnston: I believe it came down to we lost 8 spaces total. Right now we have 90 spaces with this layout. We are required to have 89.

Mr. Kohlmeier: I think we have already set a precedent of 9.5 feet with the other hotel.

Mr. Sprungle: I have an easier time justifying that.

Mr. Kohlmeier: At 9 feet I don't know how we justify that unless we are going to change the code.

Mr. Sprungle: I would have a hard time changing the code to 9 feet. I know other cities have it but other cities also have 10 feet. I know personally I appreciate a 10 foot wide parking spot more so than a 9 or 9.5 foot.

Ms. Taylor: As do I.

Mr. Sprungle: If we granted a variance in the past for 9.5 feet I would have an easier time with that.

Mr. Kohlmeier: I think that is what was approved for the hotel next door, am I right?

Mr. Kurtz: That's correct.

Mr. Kohlmeier: I think we talked last time too that the reality of it is when they restripe it in a year we're not going to have any say in how they stripe it anyway.

Mr. Brauer: We have no control over that. They are going to make them 9 feet.

Mr. Kohlmeier: And they might.

Mr. Sprungle: Yes, but I don't want to approve 9 feet.

Mr. Kohlmeier: I think we can approve at the neighboring variance but I don't think we want to approve it that way unless we want to change the code and if Pete were here I'm sure that's what he would say.

Mr. Sprungle: Do you own both properties right now, even where Phase 2 is?

Mr. Johnston: Yes, the owner Davang Patel, Dave as we call him, owns both Lots 4 and 5.

Mr. Kohlmeier: Does staff have any thoughts about the screening as justification for the side-yard variance? I was expecting there to be sort of a fence on the property line but that's not what we're seeing. It's more like raising the wall around the patios.

Mr. Kurtz: That combination of raising the wall and the landscaping itself probably provides a good screen.

Mr. Sprungle: It's probably more aesthetic too?

Mr. Kurtz: I would think so. A comment I have is I was going to ask the applicant that the screen wall appears fairly blank. It's just a brick wall shown and there was a note about no store-front windows. I was wondering if they would consider adding some texture unless the landscaping is going to mitigate that.

Mr. Johnston: It will be landscaped in front of that. The reason we didn't and it was our understanding that putting a store front which was an option but we elected not to because we didn't want to have it that close to the daycare.

Mr. Kohlmeier: I think because of the nature of what it is I think we can justify it based on the screening but also based on the fact that it is a different type of use for that space. It's a pool as opposed to the residence area and there are no windows. Maybe that is an additional justification for it.

Mr. Kurtz: And the fact that it is one story and not a whole building variance but just a portion of it.

Mr. Kohlmeier: I think we should include all of that in the record for the justification.

Mr. Sprungle: Does the Fire Department have any problem with that distance now? Is that ok?

Mr. Kurtz: Their position hasn't change from their original position in terms of their concern about getting access around still remains. They said the applicant went as far as they could with the proposed fire prevention measures.

Mr. Kohlmeier: It is 100% sprinkled correct?

Mr. Johnston: The building will be 100% sprinkled. We're going with a 13 system which is better than the standard 13-R which would be normally what is required with a hotel. In addition we added a hydrant to the site. It is not shown on this drawing it will be on one of the utility drawings. It's going to be right here (pointing to the screen).

Mr. Kohlmeier: In the back corner?

Mr. Johnston: Yes.

Mr. Sprungle: How about the height? Does the Fire Department have any problem with the height?

Mr. Kurtz: Given the utility wire there they did have concerns about getting their ladder truck through there. They prefer 360 degree access around the building and that's not possible with this arrangement and they wanted to be sure you understood that.

Mr. Johnston: Just to be clear this hotel is four stories. We are required to have one-hour ratings and two-hour ratings so the stairwells and the elevators will have a two-hour rating while the floors and walls will be a one-hour rating. In addition to a fully suppressed building it is going to have a full alarm system which is connected right to the Fire Department so if something goes off the Fire Department is involved. That is the biggest life-saving system and is the best thing for a building like this. That is what's going to save people. These ratings have been tested several times and are designed to last an hour and two hours in some cases. That is hopefully compensating for the fact that we do not have a 360 degree access.

Mr. Brauer: The Fire Department has not expressed any more concerns with that. They have this information in front of them so their finding it adequate with the 13 which is an upgraded system and the 360 around the building isn't a problem.

Mr. Kurtz: As the letter stated they want to make it clear that they would prefer the 360 degree access around the building. They said with the building itself they have done the best they could. I don't want to say that it is their preference.

Mr. Johnston: Just to give you a little reminder there is a parking lot right here. It does not give a full 360 degree access but that is another chance they have to get around to that side.

Mr. Sprungle: In that one section right here (pointing to the screen) it looks like they are going to have a little bit of trouble. They can get at it from here and they can get at it from here (pointing to the screen). So it is that one section right in here (pointing to the screen) that they would have trouble.

Mr. Johnston: Correct.

Mr. Sprungle: Is it the whole back section because you've got the playground it looks like. (Pointing to the screen) So this whole back section would be tough to get around. Here you would be ok.

Mr. Brauer: If there is no further action by the Fire Department then we're going to have to consider that adequate enough.

Mr. Adaska – 645 Treeside Drive, Stow, Ohio. I want to thank you gentlemen for anything you did to help bring this project to the community. I did have a concern about the parking spaces. When you drop from 10 to 9.5 feet that's almost understandable because we've done that next door but when you get below that to 9 feet you have people possibly carrying luggage out of their vehicle up to their room and my car or my wife's car may be the car right next to the vehicle that's getting unloaded. We have to think about that too. So people are grabbing their luggage, they've been traveling, they're anxious to get upstairs and they throw their bags around and they may sling it into the car next to them so they need all the room they can get, not less room. That is just my opinion.

Mr. Sprungle: Thank you for sharing that before we vote. I'm not inclined to approve 9 foot. I'd be inclined to approve 9.5 feet and I don't like 9.5 feet either quite frankly.

Mr. Brauer: I agree with you guys but a year from now, they are not going to be 9.5 feet.

Mr. Sprungle: Yes but I'm not going to put my stamp on it.

Mr. Kohlmeier: I think the only way we can approve and justify the 9.5 feet is that it has already been approved. If we approve 9 feet we will be approving it throughout the City.

Ms. Taylor: That is what concerns me.

Mr. Brauer: Rob talked about reviewing the code to possibly changing it and he said you have no interest in doing that.

Mr. Sprungle: He said if we went to 9 feet he would ask us to revise the code. Nine and a half would be justified given that it has already been done before.

Mr. Kurtz: Correct.

Mr. Sprungle: I feel better about it that way with the justification that it has already been approved.

Mr. Brauer: The other part of it too is they've got the other property next to them and they can expand. Maybe would should put something in the approval that a percentage of the other parking lot be created for the additional parking.

Mr. Sprungle: That is why I asked the question. If you own the other lot why don't you just extend the parking?

Mr. Johnston: (Pointing to the screen.) This is the schematic of the two hotel site plan. Nothing is set in stone for this. As we have discussed, we are only here for the one hotel. This one has not even been decided if this will be the orientation, or if this will be size or anything. When we go to Phase 2 we are already kind of encroaching and Rob and I touched on this a little bit. We're going to have to do something that allows us to extend our parking onto the second site.

Mr. Kurtz: The lots have to be joined. A condition of approval is that Lots 4 and 5 have to be joined for this phase to be approved. That could be a condition of approval so I suggested it to Mr. Johnston.

Mr. Johnston: And if the lots are joined, just to reiterate, we still would hope to be able to put a second building, we do not know what it will be yet, on the site. We do not want to join the lots and then be restricted in the future. That would be our only hesitation with joining the site or we redraw the line.

Mr. Brauer: It is going to be a hotel, correct?

Mr. Johnston: That is the goal, yes. We do not know if it is going to be two years or ten year. Do we ask for a parking space variance and go with the 9.5 foot spaces but then have to ask for a variance. So now we are asking for 5 variances instead of 4. If we go to 9.5 feet we now have to add that additional variance which we are fine with.

Mr. Kohlmeier: Is the variance to approve 8 fewer spaces? So you would have 83 spaces.

Mr. Kohlmeier moved and Mr. Sprungle seconded to approve P.C. 2015-010. **NOTES:**
Planning Commission recommended approval of the site plan subject to the Building and Engineering Department approval of construction and storm water management plans;

the City Arborist approval of the landscape plans; the applicant joining lots #4 & #5 prior to the issuance of a building permit; and Council approval of the following variances:

- (1) 1181.10(a) providing parking spaces 9.5 feet in width (min. 10 feet);**
- (2) 1145.08 building height of 48 feet for Home2 hotel (max. 35 feet);**
- (3) 1145.06 front building setback of 70 feet for Home2 hotel (min. 80 feet);**
- (4) 1145.06 side building setback of 12 feet for Home2 hotel (min. 20 feet); and**
- (5) 1181.03 (9) to provide 83 parking spaces (min. 89 required).**

Justification for #1 and #2 was that they were similar to variances previously granted to other similar uses. Justification for #3 was that several buildings on Bridgewater were located significantly closer to the right-of-way. Justification for #4 was that it involved a 1-story portion of the structure and it was adjacent to a parking lot and dumpster enclosure located on the adjacent property. Justification for #5 was that it was minimal.

YEA: Brauer, Kohlmeier, Sprungle, Taylor

NAY: None. The motion passed 4-0.

STUDY ITEM:

P.C. 2015-011: GILBERT ROAD OVERLAY DISTRICT

Mr. Kurtz: This is preliminary consideration by staff of a Gilbert Road Overlay District for the area north of Gilbert Lane, the west side of Gilbert Road and the east side of Gilbert Road north of the Lowe's development.

Background This area is somewhat isolated and is located adjacent to commercial development and S.R. 8. The property is zoned R-3 Residential and is adjacent to the Lowes/Walmart development which is zoned C-4, General Business. The property south of Gilbert Lane is zoned C-3 Community Retail and is occupied by the Stow Falls Plaza.

The 2001 Comprehensive Plan recommended office and flex-office uses for this area. There are nine single family homes within this area. Mud Brook and a tributary of Mud Brook serve as the western and northern boundary of this area.

With an overlay district, the underlying zoning district remains in place and the uses continue to be conforming uses in that district. The overlay district would allow additional uses to be developed under certain conditions.

The additional uses under consideration would include some of the uses permitted in the C-7 Office/Multi-Family District. The density and development standards would have to be evaluated.

There have been some, although not a significant amount of request for rezoning and there have been some inquiries about multi-family. In 2010 it was the first time we noted that office and multi-family uses could be considered for this area. Taking a closer look based on the most recent request about rezoning for multi-family and wanting to treat the entire area the same, the idea of a Gilbert Road Overlay District came up.

This is a somewhat isolated area. On the north they have Mud Brook and the tributary of Mud Brook that provides a northern buffer/boundary for this area. You have a commercial

development here (pointing to the screen). It is a rather unique area. It is isolated and may be suitable for an office or multi-family use based on the demand that is there.

The advantage of an overlay district is the existing uses are still conforming. You don't rezone the area and the residential single-family uses that are there now are still conforming uses. They are not out of conformance with the zoning code. With an overlay district the R-3 underlying district stays in place. If you meet certain conditions then you can take advantage of the overlay and put in office or a multi-family development in the area with the appropriate buffers from the adjacent residential uses.

The advantages are that it keeps the existing zoning in place but also allows for redevelopment if that demand is there. You also have controls because in an overlay district all the uses would be condition.

Just as an example (pointing to the screen) on the right would be all of the R-3 existing uses. Those all remain in place. With an overlay district you could possibly allow a multi-family dwelling, nursing home, assisted living and then the business uses, the administrative professional offices, medical offices, research and testing, financial establishments. Financial establishments also include banks. A bank with a drive-thru has kind of a retail aspect but you could restrict the idea of a drive-thru.

Mr. Sprungle: That's still conditionally approved.

Mr. Kurtz: Financial establishments does include a bank but in this case...

Mr. Kohlmeier: You could make a condition of no drive-thru.

Mr. Kurtz: Right, I can't imagine a drive-thru working in that area given the more residential, maybe more of an office park or a multi-family park. So it is very unlikely and we should probably recommend against that.

In summary whatever you could do in a residential district would be allowed and you could also do these additional items if you meet those certain conditions. Those conditions right now, as a basis I pulled up what we currently use in a C-7 district which is our current development stand. This is the other key items that we need to figure out.

If you are going to allow multi-family what are the development standards in terms of minimum land area, the maximum land coverage, open space and the setbacks. All those sorts of item need to be established, with the eye on protecting or buffering appropriately the adjacent single-family uses. Sometimes we have larger setbacks when it's adjacent to a residential district or residential use.

In addition to that or in lieu of that you could also require some physical buffering which sometimes is even more effective. For example you could have a buffer that needs to be at least 30 feet. Right now we have 60 feet from a residential district. If there is no buffering between those 60 feet the separation isn't as dramatic so maybe the distance isn't the key. Maybe it's more the type of buffering you require maybe it could be enhanced, because 60 feet is a fairly large side setback for this use.

I don't have any specific proposals. Mr. Zuravel on a smaller scale had a preliminary plan but I don't know that we have looked at that yet. Again I've had other interests in multi-family but no one that submitted a plan but over the years I've had a few requests in this area.

As a way of background all the property owners were notified so we could have a discussion because it affect nine single-family homes in this area right now.

I would ask for your feedback on the uses we talked about and if that seems to be the sort of uses we would allow in this district. Then secondly which involves a little more discussion is what sort of development standards are needed.

Mr. Kohlmeier: You are saying this would be something between an R-3 and a C-7?

Mr. Kurtz: Kind of going off of C-7 uses.

Mr. Kohlmeier: Some things are permitted by right?

Mr. Kurtz: Anything in the overlay district would a conditional use.

Ms. Taylor: We would have to make the conditions.

Mr. Kurtz: That is correct.

Mr. Sprungle: To make it an overlay district would we have to name the conditions now?

Mr. Kurtz: Yes. We would develop the development standards. If it was going to be developed for an office what would the standards be? If this were going to be developed for multi-family what would standards be?

Mr. Kohlmeier: So you can say banks cannot have a drive-thru and put that in there specifically.

Mr. Kurtz: Right. The financial establishments I would expect here, if office were appropriate, would be more like a mortgage company or something like that. It is not a typical retail district.

Mr. Kohlmeier: It's not highly visible. What are you looking for from the Commission at this meeting?

Mr. Kurtz: Some feedback on the uses from Planning Commission and also from the property owners to see what impact they thought it might have. It could potentially enhance the value of some properties.

Mr. Sprungle: I'm in favor of the concept. I would like to hear from the property owners about what they think would be appropriate in terms of some of the conditions.

Linda Dickey – mother Carol Lay lives at 3777 Gilbert Road, Stow Ohio. We are north of Lowes. We don't care about development. It can come, that's wonderful, we welcome whatever. But when Walmart and Lowes had their project approved 10 years ago, we were told by City Council that the road would be sidewalks all the way up to the front and all the way to the end and numerous different things at that time.

They said that if it needed to be rezoned they said they could always come for a variance. You can ask City Council for anything and as you just approved that project for the hotel, it was if we do it 9.5 for the parking spaces and they have a hotel in the future. If we take care of that variance right now, well maybe it will be 9 by then.

That's how we did the project with Lowes. We were very complaint with everything that needed to be done and we will be compliant now as homeowners but we want a fair shake at whatever you do. Take the homeowners into consideration and don't raise our taxes. She's been there 60 years. We plant flowers, we maintain, we mow and we lived there for a long time and we can go. But make it worth our time, don't raise our taxes.

It's a matter of you want to do C-7 now because it's convenient. We already played with and I say played because we went the whole 9 yards with Stow. We did everything they asked us to do. When it came down to it, the house next door \$275,000 was a business deal to get that project going. The house on the hill with 2 acres they didn't want to give her a fair shake. The people at the end of the street the same deal. Council said what will you do? What can we do for you? All we wanted was sidewalks. Do what you say you're going to do.

We put up with 4 years of a driveway that was almost impossible to get in. Planning Commission knew all about it and I can't remember what his name was that had the corvette on City Council or Engineering I think he worked with. Came up our driveway and he goes my god. I said thanks we appreciate you.

But we'll do whatever you need to do because we like development but this time just because it's convenient for you guys, it might not be convenient for her if you don't do it right in writing for us because it's hard for us to have faith in this anymore.

Mr. Sprungle: Would creating an overlay district change the tax situation?

Mr. Kurtz: No, the only thing that would make taxes change would be if you built something that wasn't there before and it would only affect the property that is being built.

Mr. Sprungle: The existing homes would not be re-evaluated because of an overlay district so that's good.

Ms. Dickey: The guarantee to that is what we were told before. If it stays R-3 that's our guarantee when it has to change come ask you for the change. The way City Hall has worked for us is what's convenient for you guys is not always a fair shake for the homeowner.

Mr. Sprungle: Correct me if I'm wrong. We're not really changing the R-3 designation.

Ms. Dickey: The proposal is R-3 to C-7 at your discretion.

Mr. Sprungle: No it's R-3 with an overlay district to use some of the conditions in C-7 as the basis for the overlay district. So it wouldn't change from R-3.

Mr. Kurtz: The underlying district is still R-3. It would basically have two zoning districts that you could take advantage of. Single-family home could remain as is but it does allow additional uses such as multi-family or office in the area we just described if you meet certain conditions.

Mr. Sprungle: Even though it stays R-3.

Mr. Kurtz: Yes, the underlying district is still R-3.

Ms. Dickey: If we came to City Hall right now and said we wanted to erect a multi-family for our personal family you guys would shoot us out of the water because even though we have two acres and I'm looking at your project plan. Where you have us at 2 acres, that spot (referring to the screen) next door does that still belong to Lowes or did they give that to Stow.

Mr. Kurtz: Yes it is still Lowes.

Ms. Dickey: Is there a proposal of any kind that you guys know about that wants to come up?

Mr. Kurtz: For which property?

Ms. Dickey: For that spot there (referring to the Lowe's property).

Mr. Kurtz: I am not aware of anything on the Lowe's property.

Ms. Dickey: Well we would really like it to stay as it is until it's time to come and talk to you guys again and we're more than happy to comply at that time.

Mr. Sprungle: I think I understand what you are saying and I agree. So what we are talking about here is we are talking about keeping it R-3 which means the taxes stay the same and we are talking about what conditions we would put on this property as an overlay district to allow for some other uses with restrictions. So I'll ask you again, what restrictions would you like to see us put on this overlay district so it would be acceptable for multi-family dwellings with the conditions we put on. We need to know what conditions you think are reasonable.

Ms. Dickey: Can I do more research to find out what I should ask you?

Mr. Sprungle: This is only a study item, so yes but when you make a recommendation...

Ms. Dickey: Well I think I do need to do that because we just got the paper in the mail and I opened it and I said oh hell it's the holiday we got to show up here.

Mr. Sprungle: We're not going to pass anything today because this is only a study item but my understanding is that we would recommend what would go into a final proposal.

Ms. Dickey: What do I look for to see if there's items that I do need to ask you for so I can intelligently make this decision.

Mr. Kurtz: It might be easier if we had a draft. I have an outline but it is not really a draft of regulations. The existing C-7 development standards are a basis for the draft.

Ms. Dickey: I got on there and I read all about that.

Mr. Kurtz: Good, I think that is a good basis to start with.

Mr. Kohlmeier: Are there things in the C-7 you find objectionable?

Ms. Dickey: I need to study that a little longer but I did find your site very easy to navigate and that was really neat for a lay person.

Mr. Kurtz: That is good to know.

Bob Adaska: I like to make these comments because I think it's helpful to try to get some of these things on record before it gets finalized and sent to Council. So that's my reason for some of these opinions.

If we're going to improve Gilbert Road I think it's important for the City also to look at the egress and ingress on that street. What I'm trying to get at is at the end of the street right now is a dead end. So now if you increase the traffic and increase the development on that street you don't want the existing homeowners to be inundated with people turning around in their driveway, the headlights, the whole nine yards.

I think if you are going to concentrate on redeveloping an area the City, Planning Commission and Council needs to consider improving the roadway. Personally, if I lived at the end of the street I wouldn't like people coming down to the end of the street, not being able to turn around and so they pull in your driveway and they go the opposite direction. So I just thought I would add that.

Mr. Kohlmeier: What is the right-of-way width?

Mr. Kurtz: It looks like it might be 60 feet. There is a little bit you can see (referring to the screen) that when this was done there was a bubble put on there so this also is City right of way. There is a turn around and there is pavement there now. It is 75 feet so it does meet the standard. That was put in I'm sure as a condition of development. This did not used to be paved. Before Walmart and Lowes were there it did not go to this distance. I don't know exactly where it cut off but it did not go this far and there was no turn around cul-de-sac.

Ms. Dickey: It was dirt road all the way to the end. They didn't have a cul-de-sac. (Speaking from the audience and some not audible).

Mr. Sprungle: That cul-de-sac was put on the property by Lowes?

Mr. Kurtz: Right, I wasn't here then but I'm sure that was a condition of approval.

Mr. Paul Zuravel – 3720 Gilbert Lane – Stow, Ohio: When we first came as a study item, I think it was back in February, I had just proposed, well you know what the original proposal was and then we started talking about the overlay.

I think that the C-7 the way it is, is an overlay district. I don't know that you really even need to tweak it that much. You know being the fact that everything's conditional anyway there's going to be plenty of time to look at whatever proposal is brought back. I personally, I mean since I brought you guys I just was concerned with my property, thinking that it would spur some development everywhere else. I kind of wanted to get going on it.

I thought that because we had the study item earlier that maybe we were at the point where we would move onto either putting an overlay district or doing the rezoning for my parcel. That's what I'd like to see really. I mean I think that no matter what we do there it's going to spur development and I think as far as the egress goes I mean I think that might be a good idea but I

don't know that it's obtainable. You'd have to go through that property on the end and then go over to Hudson Drive which would take you under Route 8.

Mr. Kohlmeier: You would need a bridge. I think they're just talking about turn circles.

Mr. Zuravel: Yes I mean it's going to stay the way it is I think regardless unless something would really change. The area that I was talking about down there, I don't know if you still have that map from the original proposal Rob.

Mr. Kurtz: (Put the map on the screen.) The original request is what is marked in yellow and was requesting to be rezoned from R-3 to C-7.

Mr. Zuravel: Right you know I'd like to I mean if there was some way we could move forward on that I mean I would appreciate it. I mean I understand that you want to include the whole area as an overlay and I think that could be done after that was done. I mean the C-7 really offers a lot of things that would be applicable to that area that would help all the property owners I think eventually if things were to take off.

I mean down there the area has waited 15 years since the Walmart development and nothing's happened and we might be missing an opportune time right now. We don't know what the economy is going to bring two years from now. Right now I have interest, two years from now I might not have. I kind of, I'm getting a little bit antsy because I don't want it to drag on for 6-8 months.

Mr. Kohlmeier: I think it's probably the same process for the overlay as it is for the rezoning. Is it any different?

Mr. Kurtz: It is a zoning amendment so it is the same.

Mr. Sprungle: Here are my thoughts on this Paul. First of all I would prefer to have the entire area rezoned rather than just the section that was in question that was in your original proposal, but I'm not against the change.

In support of the residents who live there that just want it to be a residential it seems to me that the overlay is a better way to go for the whole thing. That way it stays as an R-3 and those whose just want to keep it as their own personal residence it doesn't change that and there is no change for them. But I would be in favor of considering the overlay district for the whole thing with some of the C-7 conditions placed on the overlay. That way it satisfies your need but doesn't hinder those who just want to keep it as a personal residence and it creates a nice balance.

Mr. Zuravel: I agree with you there but I mean when we get down to what conditions are we going to allow and what uses...

Mr. Sprungle: I would consider as Rob has kind of proposed here. the conditions that are similar to what is allowable in a C-7 as the conditions on the overlay. Isn't that what you were thinking?

Ms. Taylor: Right

Mr. Zuravel: Right

Mr. Kurtz: That was the basis.

Mr. Zuravel: It's a general feeling and I don't know you can correct me if I'm wrong. Really you guys are you're not opposed to any development you just want to see something happen that's going to...

Ms. Dickey: (Speaking from the audience) That's truly going to happen and we're not going to have live through the dirt again.

Mr. Zuravel: Right

Mr. Sprungle: Or an increase in taxes if they just want to leave it as a single residence.

Mr. Zuravel: Well right and that's fine and either way yes the overlay district would be fine too. I'm trying to get a feel for...

Mr. Kohlmeier: You are worried about the limitations?

Mr. Zuravel: Not so much because I really personally think that if you took the C-7 the way it is and put it as an overlay district I think it would work great. I don't know that there is much in there that you want to tweak. It allows for mixed use, it allows for multi-family, it allows for office, it allows for any use that some business owner or developer might want to put there.

Mr. Sprungle: You are not going to believe I am going to say this but I intend to agree with you.

Mr. Zuravel: Even a blind squirrel gets a nut every once in a while Rich.

Mr. Sprungle: But I think the C-7 conditions make some sense for an overlay.

Mr. Zuravel: Then my next question would be what kind of time frame, is there any way we can expedite the process. I know Linda has some concerns about it and I think her main concern really stems from the development that happened when the Walmart went in. They didn't get their sidewalks; they didn't get things that were promised to them.

The thing is if you don't get started on something down there you can't wait for somebody to buy all that property. Some big guy and assemble everything down there and then do a big project. It's hard to do. You have to find somebody with the money and the ability and the willingness to do that and it's not like you're looking at a square open 100 acre. It's going to be hard to assemble that many separate properties. So it's going to happen incrementally and I think what I was proposing would be a good step to that increment.

I'm just asking really if we could expedite the process and Rob might know how to do that. I want to make sure they're taken care of with their concerns. Like she brought up the Lowe's property I don't know if that's designated open space from the past project or is it something they can develop in the future.

Mr. Kurtz: It is zoned R-3. The only thing you can build is a house.

Mr. Zuravel: So it was never designated open space from the Lowes project.

Ms. Dickey: We were told it was green space.

Mr. Kurtz: That could be. I don't know, I would have to look at the conditions of that approval. I was not here at the time.

Mr. Zuravel: The property at the end of the road is for sale. I don't know if they are getting any activity on it; the 14 acres at the end of the cul-de-sac. I mean they might have interest but I see them advertising as office-medical and right now it's just zoned R-3.

Mr. Kohlmeier: That's probably the way the sidewalks are going to get put in; is if that parcel develops.

Mr. Zuravel: Well maybe so I don't know. So anyway, I think you guys understand how I feel and I'd like to do something that's good for the neighborhood and I'd like to see, I mean they've seen what I've done down there so far. I've tried to keep that property up and we all try to keep up on it. Because it's such an isolated area, there are a lot of things that go on down there. Wouldn't you agree that we have to watch?

But I think if we get something going but you don't want to miss the time. I mean the way this real estate and everything is you know it's here today gone tomorrow. I think we're at an opportune time right now and I just don't want to miss it.

Mr. Kohlmeier: Basically you are going to draft something up that is going to look like the C-7.

Mr. Kurtz: Right. I think the next step would be to prepare some draft zoning regulation for an overlay district. The zoning doesn't automatically make a development. In terms of a sidewalk that really is, as Dave said, going to depend on specific projects. The zoning won't automatically create any additional development it will just allow for that.

Ms. Dickey: I understand.

Mr. Kohlmeier: If you have concerns or conditions you can approach Rob with those.

Mr. Sprungle: Take a look at what the C-7 conditions are because this overlay is going to have conditions that are at least similar to what a C-7 would be, but maintain the zoning of the R-3. So if you just want to keep it as a residence it's going to be...

Mr. Zuravel: I just want to make one more comment since she brought up the sidewalks. They just did that Graham Road project and they brought the pavement down Gilbert Road about 200 feet but there's no sidewalk on either side of the street. A lot of the people coming out of that Save-A-Lot and stuff, they're out in the middle of the street walking up the street. I know that's not you guys but I just wanted to get it on the record that I see these old people that are coming out of Save-A-Lot and they're coming into the you know people are coming off of Bailey Road. I don't know maybe we can do something about that.

Ms. Taylor: What can we do about that?

Mr. Kurtz: Sidewalks in Stow are built by the developer or private owner. If you build a house you put the sidewalk in. Obviously we replaced sidewalks on Graham Road during construction projects. Some cities assess property owners and we just don't do that in Stow. It has not been the policy to assess for sidewalks.

Mr. Sprungle: So we keep that in mind when people come to us with proposals to add sidewalks.

Ms. Taylor: Can we do that as part of the conditions?

Mr. Kurtz: It is required. If we're going to build a house somewhere and there was no sidewalk on the lot but there are sidewalks in that neighborhood you have to put in a sidewalk.

Mr. Zuravel: My point was since that was an ongoing project maybe there would be something left that they could stick a sidewalk in there. It's either side of the street. Believe it or not there is a lot of pedestrian traffic that comes off Bailey Road and goes to that shopping center now. I think that's the way things are going and people don't mind walking. We don't want anybody walking on the street. We've seen what happened out there on Copley Road this past year that kid got hit.

NOTES:

Planning Commission was generally supportive of the concept and moving forward with draft regulations.

NEXT MEETING:

The next regularly scheduled meeting is scheduled June 9, 2015

With no further business to discuss, Mr. Brauer moved and Mr. Kohlmeier seconded the motion to adjourn. It was unanimously approved and the meeting was adjourned at 7:08 p.m.

Chris Brauer
Planning Commission Chairman

Pamela H. Daerr, CPS
Planning Commission Secretary