

Note: These minutes were compiled by extracting certain facts the essence of testimony from an audiotape made of this meeting. Complete detail and verbatim statements can be heard and transcribed from the tape. The tape is available in the office of the Department of Planning and Zoning for a nominal fee.

STREETSBORO PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

**Regular Meeting
February 11, 2020
7 PM**

Call to Order – Chairperson Pavlick called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

Pledge of Allegiance and Invocation

Roll Call: Deb Covert, Curt Gallo, Tom Horsfall, Ted Hurd, Jerome Pavlick, and Marty Richmond were present.

Also present: Mayor Glenn Broska, John H. Cieszkowski, Jr. AICP Planning and Zoning Director; Sara J. Fagnilli, Assistant Law Director and Zoning Inspector Stacey Vadaj.

Disposition of Minutes: January 14, 2020 Regular Meeting.

Mr. Horsfall asked on page 2 setback be changed to set back.

Motion: Mr. Horsfall

To accept the January 14th, 2020 minutes as amended. Seconded by Mr. Hurd. Upon voice vote motion carried.

Old Business- none

Sign Review- Chapter 1159 - none

New Business –

Meadow View Phase 14 – final plat review

Mark Holz, Frontier Land Group, 25700 Science Park Drive, Ste 360, Cleveland Ohio presented the final plat for Meadow View Phase 13 with 36 lots in the north half of the development, medium lots and basically a continuation of Phases 9 and 12 installed last year. There is no pond so no fence issues. Pretty straight forward project.

Mr. Cieszkowski affirmed they were making good progress as most of his comments were minor in nature, sort of typographical with the exception of revising some of the minimum lot width at the building setback. He understood the design team was already starting to address those along with some issue with street trees and spacing. None of these items were items that had not been addressed in previous phases so he was confident in being

able to approve administratively and recommended approval subject to the comments in his staff report.

Mr. Horsfall asked about the issue with the cul-de-sac in that the fire inspector wanted the extension in very soon. He asked what was going on with that and what was “very soon”.

Mr. Cieszkowski clarified the fire inspector stated in the memo that he wanted the street extended within 6 months to a year. He thought GPD’s comments mirrored that as well. He asked Mr. Holz to speak to future phasing since he was probably involved in the conversation of wanting to remove the temporary cul-de-sac or not have to put it in because they would be extending the street in the near future.

Mr. Holz asked if this was a temporary cul-de-sac in this phase or a previous phase.

Mr. Cieszkowski affirmed it was in this phase (14).

Mr. Holz stated in previous phases he and Mr. Ciuni had put in a temporary cul-de-sac but doing it lighter than the spec would be because they were so quickly moving into the next phase so the agreement he has with Mr. Ciuni is that he will maintain that cul-de-sac and if at any point and time it is deemed not to be sufficient enough for a fire truck to turn around he would go in and add more stone and ramp it up. He would do the same thing in this case. He planned on doing another phase in both the north and south in 2020 so the temporary cul-de sac will be immediately replaced by either Phase 15 or 16 however it will be numbered. There will be two more phases after this one in 2020.

Mr. Cieszkowski added the road ends two sublots after the intersection so they wanted to make sure that fire was copasetic with that being able to be used as the turnaround in lieu of the cul-de-sac and that was the feedback he got from fire.

Mr. Horsfall wanted it on record that should this for some reason unforeseen by you it doesn’t happen in the next 6 months then you would still...what he got from the email was the elimination of the temporary cul-de-sac but it sounds like you are putting a temporary cul-de-sac in.

Mr. Holz affirmed they would put the temporary cul-de-sac in but it was not as thick of stone for the vehicles to turn; it was not to ODOT spec. He said “we could put on record that if we do not proceed with a Phase 15 or 16, depending on how the numbering is, in 2020 before the end of the year they would install a proper cul-de-sac”.

Mr. Horsfall said that was what he wanted. He did not see a police comment letter on this phase.

Mr. Cieszkowski affirmed they did not receive a comment letter from the Police Department but with that said the last time he followed up with Chief Powers for Phase 13 his comment back to Mr. Cieszkowski was he didn’t have any comments on any of the

phases of Meadow View. He did not want to assume as much so asked for this phase but did not receive the comment.

Mr. Horsfall pointed out there was nothing from Portage County Water Resources (PCWR).

Mr. Cieszkowski affirmed they had not but could not force PCWR to comment but knew the plans were sent to them in advance of the meeting.

Mr. Holz affirmed PCWR had the plans and had commented directly to the engineer with a copy to the City and then run their own pre-construction meeting. He assured the Commission that nothing gets by PCWR but they have their own process they follow. He also knew that one of their key personnel has been out for a while and just recently back so he was playing catchup.

Mr. Horsfall clarified he wanted the door left open so if PCWR came back with comments he would respond.

Mr. Holz affirmed.

Mr. Cieszkowski affirmed PCWR has their own pre-con meeting but they also have inspectors that are at the table when the City holds their pre-con meetings.

Motion: Mr. Horsfall

I hereby move on this 11th day of February, 2020, the Streetsboro Planning and Zoning Commission approve a Final Plat for Meadow View Subdivision Phase 14, 36 single family residential lots, Zoning District R-2 Medium Density Urban Residential per site plan received 1-13-2020. Subject to administrative review and approval of conditions attached hereto as noted in the Planning and Zoning Director's memo dated February 5, 2020. Seconded by Mr. Richmond. Roll call: Yes – 6, No – 0. Motion carried.

Singletary Drive – Streetsboro Laser Wash – Integrated Development Plan (IDP) amendment

Matthew Weber, Weber Engineering Services, 2555 Hartville Road, and introduced Brian Cancelliere, the owner, and Brian Fabo, the architect for the project. He said Mr. Cieszkowski made a thorough review of the plan and they met today on another matter but discussed the few revisions to the plan and he didn't see anything that would prevent them from adequately satisfying his comments and requirements for the amended plan.

Mr. Cieszkowski added that Mr. Weber was not working from an accurate version of the IDP which was what necessitated his comments. Mrs. Vadaj was able to locate the most up to date version of the integrated development plan which we provided to Mr. Weber to use in making the revisions. He was confident the applicant would be able to get the revisions taken care of given the information provided to the applicant today. He

suggested they incorporate into the IDP motion sheet reference to the replat since both the replat and the IDP amendment will be presented to Council for approval on the same evening. He felt the two items go hand in hand and didn't want to cause any confusion either with the Commission or Council.

Motion: Mr. Horsfall

I hereby move on this 11th day of February, 2020, the Streetsboro Planning and Zoning Commission recommend approval to City Council for an Integrated Development Plan amendment and a replat for Smart Wash Systems (Streetsboro Laser Wash), Singletary Drive, Parcel # 35-033-00-00-007-007, For the General Layout and Future Uses per site plan received 1-3-2020. Subject to administrative review and approval of conditions attached hereto as noted in the Planning and Zoning Director's memo dated February 3, 2020. Seconded by Mr. Gallo. Roll call: Yes – 6, No – 0. Motion carried.

Singletary Drive – Streetsboro Laser Wash – conditional use permit and site plan review

Motion: Mr. Horsfall

I hereby move on this 11th day of February, 2020, the Streetsboro Planning and Zoning Commission consider a conditional use permit for Smart Wash Systems (Streetsboro Laser Wash), Singletary Drive, Parcels #35.033.00.00.007.007 to construct and operate an approximately 2,524 sq. ft. car wash. Seconded by Mr. Richmond.

Roll call: Yes – 6, No – 0. Motion carried.

Ms. Fagnilli swore in Mr. Weber.

Mr. Weber stated in the memorandum from the Planning Director it clearly identifies the use criteria by which the applicant was requesting the conditional use and he didn't have any further clarification for those items. He believed the applicant has met all the requirements and conditions for this application.

Mr. Cieszkowski pointed out the revised site plan at their seats, Sheet C-102. [Exhibit A] One of the specific conditional use standards is stacking space or making sure that the proposed use does not interfere with traffic on adjacent roadways which is why he asked the applicant to provide an indication to the Commission of the proposed stacking space on the subject site. It was mentioned in his staff comments that he felt the site would be adequate in terms of stacking space and would not interfere with traffic and therefore would comply with the specific conditional use standard but wanted the Commission to see for themselves on a drawing the stacking space to confirm his comments. He believed the applicant had complied with all of the general and specific conditional use standards relative to car washes.

Mr. Horsfall asked if this was just whether or not it fits as a conditional use.

Mr. Cieszkowski affirmed this was issuance of the conditional use permit.

Motion: Mr. Horsfall

I hereby move on this 11th day of February, 2020, the Streetsboro Planning and Zoning Commission approve a conditional use permit for Smart Wash Systems (Streetsboro Laser Wash), Singletary Drive, Parcels #35.033.00.00.007.007 to construct and operate an approximately 2,524 sq. ft. car wash. Seconded by Ms. Covert.

Roll call: Yes – 6, No – 0. Motion carried.

Mr. Weber presented the applicant would comply with all the items Mr. Cieszkowski set forth. They made a quick change to screening for the gas meter as requested and after meeting with Mr. Cieszkowski today they made some other revisions. He handed out Sheet A-2 [Exhibit B] and a picture of the Starbucks/at&t building [Exhibit C].

Mr. Richmond asked to confirm the screening for the gas meter was what Mr. Cieszkowski was not comfortable administratively reviewing.

Mr. Cieszkowski affirmed that was why he asked the applicant bring the revised drawings to the meeting [Exhibit B].

Mr. Weber said one of the concerns was adequate screening for the gas meter since it is on the front of the building. Originally they had tried to screen it with vegetation but after he met with Mr. Cieszkowski they had determined that vegetation may not last too long in that application so he put a screen wall that matches the front of the building to hide the meter. The gas company requires that there be some visual appearance to it but this would do a nice job of screening it to blend in with the building.

Mr. Cieszkowski appreciated the quick turnaround. He asked if there was a possibility of moving the meter to the rear of the building.

Mr. Weber said the utility company, gas especially, wants a straight line from the street to the meter so it would either have to go on the side of the building or the front but this was the most logical location due to the mechanical operation inside.

Mr. Cieszkowski stated it could not be on the north side adjacent to a drive isle and the other side it could go close to the electric transformer but he didn't know how the two of those jive in terms of separation so this sounds like the most logical location.

Mr. Weber said the electrical will be screened by arborvitae.

Mr. Cieszkowski pointed out the second page [of Exhibit A] was the landscape screening around the transformer to the south of the building.

Mr. Horsfall pointed out the director's memo cited there was extensive landscaping to the rear of the building but he wished to have more, further up.

Mr. Cieszkowski affirmed his comment was that the heaviest landscape portion of the site was around the detention pond which was at the rear of the site. In looking at the drawings, he realized the applicant did not have time to address all of his comments and asked them to add some additional landscaping for this plan but the plan given to them today does have coniferous plantings along the north and south boundary; the applicant and he had spoken about adding similar plantings to the area between the Singletary right-of-way and the vacuum cleaners so there will be additional conifers planted there. He had asked for supplemental landscaping to be added to screen the vacuum units from view from Singletary; those are not shown on this plan but are included as a condition which the applicant has agreed to.

Mr. Horsfall was trying to figure out the traffic patterns on the drawings since he saw a lot of arrows so he was glad, on the drawings the Commission just received, the applicant had added arrows actually going into the wash bays showing where the vehicles would progress. Everything was going to go from the back of the property to the front when the vehicle is being washed. Once it comes out the other end there is a single access to the south and a double access on the top (north) which he thought would be two way traffic.

Mr. Weber affirmed.

Mr. Horsfall stated if he was going out there was a nice circular pattern but there was another way in so once he comes in the other way he makes a hard right turn, go all the way across and then make a left to go around the building.

Mr. Weber said that one of Mr. Cieszkowski's comments was to identify either inside the building or immediately as they leave the building that vehicles make a right turn to exit to the north. If a vehicle comes in from the south they have a decision to go through and around to the car washes to turn into the vacuums.

Mr. Horsfall clarified the vacuums are up front.

Mr. Weber affirmed.

Mr. Horsfall said if you come in off Singletary and make a hard right to go to the vacuums but now there is an arrow pointing right at me and asked where that vehicle was coming from. Has he just used the vacuum and is going to the north. He wanted to know if the final traffic flow is reflected on these drawings.

Mr. Cieszkowski said it was not and would be part of the administrative review for on-site circulation pavement markings since he felt there should be another arrow facing up. He also brought up that inside the building there should be a sign letting folks know that they need to turn right to exit the site.

Mr. Horsfall was sure it would turn out right with Mr. Cieszkowski working with them.

Mr. Hurd wanted to be clear there was a list of recommendations 35 items long and those are some of the details or the tasks Mr. Cieszkowski went over with the applicant and the applicant was pretty much in agreement with all the items that were brought up.

Mr. Cieszkowski affirmed that was his understanding and not only was that expressed verbally today but right after receiving his comments he got a response back from the owner (Brian Cancelliere) who indicated that they had no issues and would comply with the recommendations. He didn't normally ask applicants to bring drawings in to the meeting but he thought if there was a scope to a proposed condition that he was not comfortable administratively approving he may start asking applicants to start doing that. In this case it worked out fine, the group was able to get revised plans addressing his comments in front of the Commission. He let the applicants know that if they had issues with any of the conditions to let him know in advance of the meeting and be prepared to address them this evening but he had gotten no input to that effect either before the meeting or here tonight. He didn't see any issues with verifying conformance with the conditions of approval.

Mr. Hurd thanked him and said that was what he wanted to know because he didn't want one of these issues to become a stickler down the road.

Mr. Cieszkowski said he had mentioned this before to Mr. Pavlick and Mr. Horsfall, as chairs, that if there is ever an applicant, after the fact, pushing him past where he felt comfortable administratively approving something he would say hold on, this needs to go back to the Commission if you want to make that type of a change to what was put before the Commission.

Mr. Horsfall asked if this meets all the design standards for the IDP.

Mr. Cieszkowski clarified the Streetsboro Commons design standards and he did go through item by item for the list of materials that were provided and because Mr. Fabo had involvement with designing other buildings in Streetsboro Commons he was familiar with the colors and the type of brick required, as a result it was reflected on the fixture schedule in front of the Commission this evening.

Mr. Horsfall asked if there were two basic colors of brick to this building.

Brian Fabo, Fabo Architecture, 1736 Columbus Road, Cleveland 44113 presented two main field colors (base and main field) and one accent color. These are the identical materials on the Starbucks building with the exception that this has a pitched shingled roof whereas the other building was a flat rubber roof. He showed them a shingle sample.

Mr. Cieszkowski pointed out some of the other buildings in Streetsboro Commons have a silver frame around the windows but not every building (Sonic and IHOP) has that silver framing but both IHOP and Sonic have a similar window frame color to what is being proposed this evening. He did review what was proposed against the design standards and could verify conformance.

Mr. Horsfall asked if the doors were going to be a polycarbonate and if that was a heavy plastic.

Mr. Cancelliere said the rendering looked like polycarbonate but they were vinyl roll up doors.

Mr. Horsfall asked if they were opaque.

Mr. Cancelliere said there was a view panel in the second course so a customer can actually see if there was a vehicle in the wash. He added he was changing the polycarbonate out of his other car wash today because they were awful.

Mr. Horsfall agreed they discolored and became not opaque.

Mr. Cancelliere affirmed they look horrible.

Mr. Cieszkowski asked since he didn't see it on the renderings, the awning color on the north elevation.

Mr. Fabo said it will match the sloped awning design as well as the window framing on the Starbucks.

Mr. Cieszkowski clarified it was the silver and the silver.

Mr. Fabo affirmed it would be the slanted awning as opposed to the flat awning with silver around the window framing.

Mr. Cieszkowski handed out a picture of the Starbucks building to show what most of the buildings in Streetsboro Commons have and this building will match. [Exhibit C].

Motion: Mr. Horsfall

I hereby move on this 11th day of February, 2020, the Streetsboro Planning and Zoning Commission approve a site plan for Smart Wash Systems (Streetsboro Laser Wash), Singletary Drive, Parcel #35.033.00.00.007.007 to construct and operate an approximately 2,524 sq. ft. car wash per site plan received 1-3-2020 and additional drawings C-102, C-102D and elevations A2 received 2-11-2020. Subject to administrative review and approval of conditions attached hereto as noted in the Planning and Zoning Director's memo dated February 3, 2020. No construction shall commence until a zoning certificate has been paid for and issued by the Planning and Zoning Department and a building permit has been paid for and issued by the Building Department. With the stipulation that before any occupancy permits are issued, a final inspection is made to insure compliance with all City requirements and the approved site plan. If future expansion or signage for the project is indicated on the site plan it will not be approved at this time. Seconded by Mr. Hurd.

Roll call: Yes – 6, No – 0. Motion carried.

Reports, Communications and Correspondence

Mr. Cieszkowski reported they had identified a kick off meeting for the Core Concept Plan, Design Standards and Zoning amendments that will take place here at City Hall at 9 am Wednesday, February 19th. They had provided info to the members on the Commission that expressed interest in serving as well as members of City Council, and 3 members of the administration (Mr. Cieszkowski, the Economic Development Director and the Mayor). He can provide to the Commission a project schedule but it would be the third Wednesday of every month. He planned if things go smoothly at the working committee level that they would be presenting to the Planning Commission at some point in November, followed by a City Council presentation in December. He looked forward to the consultants towing the load and doing most of the heavy lifting and he would be involved as an integral part of the planning process but he knew he was not the only person in the City that was excited to get the process started.

Mr. Horsfall asked if those were closed meetings or could anyone who wanted to attend.

Mr. Cieszkowski said none of their meetings were closed and if anyone wanted to attend they were welcome to.

Mr. Pavlick asked if it would be published in the paper.

Mr. Cieszkowski hadn't worked out the details nor did he now the lead time needed for that type of notice. He just received the project schedule today as well as the agenda. He asked Mrs. Vadaj to get that posted to the website. He was not sure about the kick off meeting but would be sure to get the future meetings into the newspaper. The working committee meetings would be in the conference room but if it makes sense or if there is more public that wants to attend they may hold them in Council Chambers as well.

Citizens' Comments - none

Commission Member Comments - none

Announcements: The next Regular Planning and Zoning Commission meeting will be held Tuesday, March 10th, 2020 at 7PM at the Streetsboro Municipal Building (555 Frost Road).

Adjournment: There being no further business before this Commission a motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Horsfall and seconded by Mr. Richmond and the meeting was adjourned at 7:51 pm.

Attest:

Stacey Vadaj, Zoning Inspector

Jerome Pavlick, Chairperson