## City of Avon Lake Planning Commission Work Session

C. . . . . .

Taken on May 16, 2023

Reporter Melissa Cruz

	City of Avon Lake Planning Com	ımıs	sion Meeting, May 16, 2023
1	MR. EBERT: We're going to	1	MR. ESBORN: Mrs. Raymond.
2	miss this planning commission is going to	2	MS. RAYMOND: Yes.
3	miss you as chairman. You've been very,	3	CHAIRMAN PLUNKETT: Thank you.
4		4	That concludes the regular meeting of the
5	very - MS. RAYMOND: I second that,	5	planning commission.
6	MR. EBERT: not only helpful	6	We'll move into our work session. As
7	but intuitive, et cetera, and ran a great	7	you're aware, the conversations that happen
8	meeting, and we wish you all the success and	8	during the work session are nonbinding for the
9	good luck in Texas.	9	planning commission. This is an open
10	CHAIRMAN PLUNKETT: Thank you.	10	discussion in which we'll engage in
11	I appreciate it.	11	conversations about different project aspects.
12		12	We have seen you obviously before, so we're
13	Would someone can to make a motion to	13	interested in leaping into this as quickly as
14	adjourn this, the regular session:	14	we can.
15	also thank you for your service. And we're	15	Roll call, please.
16	trying to figure out what it was. Five years	16	MR. ESBORN: Mrs. Fenderbosch.
3.7	approximately, you finished up the term, and	17	MS. FENDERBOSCH: Here.
18	you have a little bit left on this one.	18	MR. ESBORN: Mr. Haas.
19	CHAIRMAN PLUNKETT: Yeah, I think	19	MR. HAAS: Here.
20	so. Pretty close.	20	MR. ESBORN: Mrs. Ma.
21	MAYOR ZILKA: Well, you've done a	21	DR. MA: Here.
22	great job, and we appreciate all of the	22	MR. ESBORN: Mr. Orille.
23	efforts. I know there were a lot of phone	23	MR. ORILLE: Here.
24	calls before and after meetings to clarify	24	MR. ESBORN: Mr. Plunkett.
25	things and get us on the right track. And your	25	CHAIRMAN PLUNKETT: Here.
	Page 46	$\Box$	Page 48
1	professionalism and your professional	1	MR. ESBORN: Mrs. Raymond.
2	experience has really been an asset to the	2	MS. RAYMOND: Here.
3	city, so we really appreciate your service.	3	MR. ESBORN: Mayor Zilka.
4	Good luck to you in Texas.	4	MAYOR ZILKA: Here.
5	CHAIRMAN PLUNKETT: Thank you.	5	MR. ESBORN: Director of Law,
0	I appreciate it.	6	Ebert.
	Now, will someone care to make a motion?	7	MR. EBERT: Here.
8	MS. PENDERBOSCH: I'll make the	8	MR. ESBORN: And I'm community
9	motion to adjourn.	9	development director Esborn, here.
10	Is there a second?	10	CHAIRMAN PLUNKETT: Please read
11	MS. RAYMOND: I second.	11	the first case.
12	CHAIRMAN RLUNKETT: Call the	12	MR. ESBORN: Case WS 003-23, this
13	roll, please.	1 1	is Avon Lake Land Holdings, Sandridge Run R-2
14	MR. ESBORN: Mr. Plunkett.	14	Development. This is a request of Avon Lake
15	CHAIRMAN PLUNKETT: Yes.	15 16	Land Holdings for a review and discussion of
16	MR. ESBORN: Mr. Haas.	1 1	their proposed modification to the design of
17	MR. HAAS: Yes.	17	the Sandridge Run R-2 Development. Approved by
18	MR. ESBORN: Mr. Orille.	18	planning commission in February of 2022.
19	MR. ORILLE: Yes.	19	This project is located on the west side
20	MR. ESBORN: Ms. Fenderbosch.	20	of Avon Belden Road between Walker Road and
21	MS. FENDERBOSCH: Yes.	21	Webber Road in an R-2 multi-family residence
22	MR. ESBORN: Mayor Zilka.		district. The project is recated on 71 con
23	MAYOR ZILKA: Yes.	23	Belden that just to the south and west of
24	MR. ESBORN: Dr. Ma.	24	Huntington Bank. The properties involved in
25	DR. MA: Yes.	123	the Sandridge Run development were rezoned from

Page 50

Page 49

R-1, single-family, to R-2, multi-family, in 2020.

In early 2022, planning commission approved a site improvement plan for Sandridge Run. As part of that case, the applicant requested and was granted use of alternative equivalency for identity that exceeded the R-2 standard of five units per acre.

The current proposal from the applicant is a modified site design and an increase of three units. Avon Lake Land Holdings has formally applied under our current planning and zoning code for alternative equivalency. As part of site plan approval for an increased density, alternative equivalency is detailed in 1214.06(e) of the planning and zoning code.

Based on the discussions of the planning commission, this case will be revised and will come back to planning commission for site plan approval.

CHAIRMAN PLUNKETT: Thank you. Mr. Gamella.

MR. GAMELLA: Jim Gamella, 32745 Walker Road, Avon Lake, and I have been sworn in.

CHAIRMAN PLUNKETT: Yes.

MR. GAMELLA: To piggyback Ted's comments, to welcome you to Avon Lake and Doctor, congratulations. That's quite an honor.

I appreciate you letting us come back tonight to review this project with you. What I want to do tonight is, I wanted to give you a little bit of an update of where we're at, review some site plan alterations that Doug and Jim and I have been working on, and then try to get maybe some input as far as procedure after tonight.

So, basically --

Doug, if you want to put that up so we can get a visual of this.

So as Ted was giving us an overview, we did engage in an awful lot of our off-site work. That was one of the things that we wanted to do when we came the last time, and we did get our approval.

Just because of the traffic on Avon
Belden and the timing of everything, we ran
into a roadblock with some of our supply chain
issues that we were experiencing on this site

where we could not get verification that we were going to be able to get utilities to hook up to.

And, now, this -- that would be our
Tuscan Village where we had our last
subdivision ready to go in August of last year.
April, we finally got power to that
subdivision. So there was just a tremendous
amount of problems still out there. Even
suggested this week, that there are three
companies that manufacture transformers in the
United States. So not having transformers
means we have power. So we did not want to get
ahead of ourselves and have the infrastructure
and not have any power to feed into those. So
that was one of the verbiage.

So during this time frame, Doug and Jim, I asked them, you know, is there anything that we could do based upon two things? There were a lot of great comments that came out of the planning commission when we were trying to develop this project as far as streetscape. It's kind of been the entrance into our city from the south, and there's a lot things that we tried to incorporate into that. So I asked

Doug and Jim to try to come up with some different ideas that we could enhance that streetscape keeping with the theme of our original development.

And then in our last meeting that we had together, Jim had mentioned that we would be coming back for a phase 2. So we thought, at this point, let's try to see what we can do with the streetscape. Let's see what we can do with the other part of our subdivision that we wanted to try to bring in, which has added three units to our project as was suggested here at the onset.

So what Doug and Jim have come up with is moving actually our retention basin to the north. In doing that, we're able to come up with kind of a focal point where we're taking that gazebo and that common entry that could be used not only for our residents but all people that are using Avon Belden to access, whether it'd be the bank or a place to eat or do something of that nature.

So, Doug, if you will point out that focal point where that gazebo is now.

That will be kind of enhancing where we

Page 52

Page 51

Page: 13 (49 - 52)

Page 54

were kind of like to set a community in there.

And, obviously, looking at that retention basin, that's going to be for the folks to kind of congregate whether they're in this Sandridge Run subdivision or people that are out for a walk or doing anything that's in our Towne Center focus area.

And, Doug, if you wouldn't mind putting that up just so we could get just a little visualization of that gazebo and that focal point.

MR. BALDI: Yeah. I think what I'm going to do is show you two things. It's -- this is our original streetscape that we had proposed, and it was approved with the Sandridge Run, which were the signs on the sides of the entry and fencing along the front.

What we've done is, as it extended to the north end here, which is right in this direction, we have extended that. And here's the entry that you were seeing. And then putting up a pergola structure that would be overlooking the lake with the city sidewalk walking by and then walks going in an area here with three benches that would be overlooking

the pond or just to sit in and chat and everything like that.

You know, one of the things -- the master plan that was developed was talking about these walkable neighbors and everything. And we thought that this would be something that, even though we don't have townhouses bordering right up against Route 83, we're trying to bring in some amenities that would be a focal point for not only residents here but just the people walking by or a meeting place.

Obviously, Route 83 probably isn't the greatest place to meet up, but it's slowing things down. It's not just another set of driveways in the project like that. So, you know, we're doing something a little creative there with some different elevations to the pergola to make it -- to set it off in there and everything for the project.

And then that brings us back to -- that would be right on Route 83. Next to the bank, north of these units, we have the detention basin now here. Before, the -- we really didn't have detention basins. We have one small wet one, but the rest of them were dry.

Expanding this project and opening it up to the north allowed that pond to get much bigger and actually be more of a functioning basin than it was

To remind you, the original project was kind of all down at the south end of it, didn't extend to the north, and we were -- it had it that way with the intention that there was a road going to the north. What we've done is just completed that and made it so we not only have that, but to the north end, we're terminating it into a grass open area.

One of the things that we have found at Tuscan is that the residents there -- one of the things that we're finding is a lot of the residents are retired. They have grandkids coming over and everything like that. They like the idea of the unit with minimal amount of maintenance around it, but they also need a place where kids can come. And, you know, if they have a frisbee or something, they can go over there, or they can run around with the dog or something like that, and so we're putting that there.

It would really be great if somewhere

along the line the Taco Bell property to the north, maybe, could be combined in with that overall thing.

But we just -- and then the other thing -- do you want me just to go on here? I'm on a roll.

MR. GAMELLA: Yeah.

MR. BALDI: And the other thing is, we have revised the housing type here, because one of the things with the changing economics and everything like that is, these units would have first floor masters on them. The other ones that we had proposed before were not all first floor masters, and we really felt that with the market changes we're seeing and the economics that are coming in and who's looking at the units, that this was a much more viable product.

So, basically, the main street, the circle coming in that's going to the north, all of that has remained very similar to the original street. This building here shifted. This building here shifted a little bit, but it actually brings up, I think, the -- it gives you a more unique streetscape going through

Page 56

Page 57

there and allows a little bit -- some better spaces between the buildings, also, that we ended up with.

MR. GAMELLA: Thank you, Doug. I feel that they've done a great job. I wish I could take credit for the ingenuity, but I can't.

But the streetscape really sang to me as far as what we want to try to project.

And then, Scott, you had mentioned that. And, Shawn, you had mentioned that.

It's really, you know, what can we do. And I think what they've done now, I feel, really lends itself not only to the development but also to that streetscape for the city.

Plus, being able to come up with that green space opens up space in the hope that sometime in the future that maybe the neighbors to the north will see that that property would have a better use from a city's standpoint than a commercial standpoint, especially with the way that the top of that building was laid out.

And that would kind of lead us to maybe take walkability into -- and I know the safety center doesn't want a lot of walkability there,

which probably don't have those features of the fence involved, but it allows that opportunity. So I think as long as we're trying to allow the opportunity, we could get the chance to have the connectivity that we all spoke about.

So that is the design that they've come up with, is 28 units. That's a little bit about what we've done and also on a new plan and then after we've had a chance to get all of your ideas and comments, you know, and try to figure out what our steps forward are.

So with that, I'll hand it back to the planning commission.

CHAIRMAN PLUNKETT: Thank you.

You know, I really like what you've done. I think it's really sensitive to the spaces around it. I like the gazebo. That's a real big area south on 83 there, that's a lot of concrete and median that you're sort of dodging in between.

MR. GAMELLA: Uh-huh.
CHAIRMAN PLUNKETT: So to have a little respite point, whether it's used a lot or not, at the end of that, I think, is a really nice gesture within the plan. And it's

a way of providing a view corridor for people into the site, which is they tend to be sort of reclusive, right? They have buffer zones and stuff, so I think it's a nice, attractive piece.

I don't fundamentally have any comments or anything about the layout of the buildings. I tend to think that, you know, the general concept of the master plan for the city is to drive some density here, so I don't fundamentally have any issues with increased density on the site. I think it goes to the kind of product and density that you would look for at the city core. I like that you have left some of that green space. So I think -- you know, good job to you guys.

I don't know -- what's the difference in unit size? You mentioned first floor masters. Are there significant footprint on it that exist?

MR. GAMELLA: To answer your question, there will be a little bit more frontage to the units. And then incorporating that master bedroom on the first floor, that also allows us to capitalize on work-from-home

Page 60

space that appears to be something that's going to be with us from here on out.

And when you look at the amenities that we have in Cleveland, certainly, the amenities that we have in Avon Lake on the west side, it opens up the possibility to have, you know, professional people living in our community, living on the west side, but working in other cities or even other states.

So it was equally important, as Doug mentioned, to get that first floor master but also to make sure and accentuate our work-from-home space.

MR. BALDI: The units are four-foot wider.

CHAIRMAN PLUNKETT: Four-foot wider, so it doesn't really constrict the space between the rooms to fill themselves substantially?

MR. BALDI: No. Actually, because we were able to --

CHAIRMAN PLUNKETT: Spread it

out?

MR. BALDI: -- spread it out and everything like that, we actually ended up with

Page 62

similar spaces or even, in some cases, larger.

CHAIRMAN PLUNKETT: Okay. Thank
you.

Mr. Haas.

MR. HAAS: So I like the new

plan. I think the gazebo and the retention ponds is a great idea.

First thing I'd do if I was on the

homeowners' association is put a no trespassing sign on that because, you know, they're not going to want kids coming from school, getting their Taco Bell, and going in the gazebo, and then walking in their backyards.

CHAIRMAN PLUNKETT: They have to do some banking first and then go to Taco Bell.

MR. HAAS: I think it's a noble idea, but I'm sure the residents are not going to want people wandering around in their backyards. You've had that issue before at Chardon when we talked about the walkway. That would have been a great idea to connect back to the park.

But at the end of the day, residents are not going to want that. So I -- unless you put something in your homeowners' regulations or

restrictions that prohibit the homeowners' association from doing that, I -- you may be overselling the public access to that gazebo.

MR. GAMELLA: Yeah. If I may, and you're right, it's a fine line. I mean, we're probably at the height of young activity at our Tuscan Village project. When Learwood School lets out, there's a tremendous amount of young adults that go over to the shopping center.

So I think, you know, visually, obviously, during the winter months, you're probably not going to get a lot of traffic.
But I think it just softens that view. And we wanted to try to tie some of the amenities here into what Mr. Kopf has done at Towne Center, so that pergola and the way that Doug designed that and the water feature -- obviously, that was a beautiful water feature there at the Towne Center sign -- I wanted to try to tie that in together.

But you are right, it does kind of open up the door a little bit more for, you know, Billy and Susie. They have a Taco Bell there and some garbage and things. So that's -- it's kind of a fine line.

MR. HAAS: It's a nice idea, but it's not going to be a park. And I don't think the residents are going to want -- I'm not suggesting you change it because I think the residents will like it, but...

MR. GAMELLA: You made a good point. You're right.

MR. HAAS: It's -- but I do like the changes.

On the density issue, Ted, I didn't quite understand the reference to that in terms of the alternative equivalency review. I don't see where the density issue is specifically covered in that section, but I may be missing something.

MR. ESBORN: So I guess just to back up a little bit, with the approval that the project got in early 2022, which because there was a complete application done in 2021, the processing, even though in early '22, was under -- it was done under the old code. So that was -- you know, that makes sense.

But that approval -- as part of that approval, the planning commission used the

equivalency provision from the old code to waive a few things. And in the old code, the equivalency provision, I think, does say that it's a waiver. And so it was good density because I think, at that point, the project was at 5.3 or, you know, still a little bit over five, but then I think also the space between buildings and one other that I can't recall.

So one of the things that we've been looking at and, you know, we've really been sort of trying to sort of work out the old code/new code issues with the project because it -- there's a few of them.

So there's now from a new density, and so we're looking at whether, you know, using the new alternative equivalency provision will work in this situation. I would say that's something we're still working on, but that's how it comes into play, is that, you know, the use of that alternative equivalency provision is the only way that planning commission could approve the project at a higher density than five units an acre. So...

MR. HAAS: If we can be clear on that, when they come into who?

Page 64

Page 63

	City of Avon Lake Planning Commission Meeting, May 16, 2023							
1	Page 65 CHAIRMAN PLUNKETT: Yeah. And I	1	The little white dot, is that a path that					
2	think as an extension of that conversation,	2	I see? I'm going to show you where it is.					
3	Bob, I think at the time that we're making a	3	It's right here and here, Mr. Baldi.					
4	decision, the city had just gone through the	4	Yes, exactly.					
5	city's vetting process. So our old provisions	5	Is that drainage?					
6	weren't going to line up with the new	6	MR. BALDI: The dry basin on					
7	provision. So this was we were using the	7	MS. FENDERBOSCH: Oh, the dry					
8	old pretext in order to substantiate an outcome	8	basin. Okay.					
9	that was more in line with the city plan. So I	9	MR. BALDI: Yeah. This is a dry					
10	think we're just jogging our way through that.	10	basin					
11	The question, I think, fundamentally for	11	MS. FENDERBOSCH: Okay.					
12	this group is, does this have the right density	12	MR. BALDI: which was actually					
13	that we believe to match what the city's	13	on the other plan, also. This one was. The					
14	ultimate goal is?	14	other one was in a different location.					
15	_	15	MS. FENDERBOSCH: It's been a					
16	As, you know, to me, whether that's five-and-three-quarters or that's	16	while. So					
17	six-and-a-half is not a large leap on a site of	17	MR. BALDI: Yeah, it was.					
18	this kind.	18	MS. FENDERBOSCH: It's been a					
19		19						
20	MR. HAAS: Thank you. CHAIRMAN PLUNKETT: Sure.	20	year.  MR. BALDI: This is a dry basin.					
21	Mr. Orille.	21	MS. FENDERBOSCH: Okay. Thank					
22	MR. ORILLE: Yes. I agree with	22	·					
23	the chairman. The increased density doesn't	23	you.  And the marks that you have that are					
24	bother me at all, and I think that's a	24	here, is that an elevation mark? Is that what					
25	tremendous improvement to the plan. I really	25	that is? Up and down					
$\dashv$	Page 66	П	Page 68					
1	like it. So you did a great job.	1	MR. BALDI: That's a slope on the					
2	MR. GAMELLA: Thanks to all of	2	side of					
3	you. You have a lot of great comments, and	3	MS. FENDERBOSCH: the					
4	these two gentlemen were able to incorporate	4	elevation?					
5	them. So thank you.	5	MR. BALDI: the dry the wet					
6	CHAIRMAN PLUNKETT:	6	basin in that.					
7	Ms. Fenderbosch.	7	MS. FENDERBOSCH: I think it's					
8	MS. FENDERBOSCH: Thank you.	8	lovely. Thank you.					
9	I also think it's a great plan. And I	9	No further questions.					
10	like how it's curving, and it's not just	10	CHAIRMAN PLUNKETT: Thank you.					
11	straight. The streetscape is lovely.	11	Mr. Mayor.					
12	Also, I see that there's more parking.	12	MAYOR ZILKA: I have to apologize					
13	Even though there's higher density, there's	14	to Mr. Haas, because about 15 years ago, when I					
14!	more parking with this plan than there was with	15	was maybe in my early 60s, I was one of the					
15	the other one. I think that's a bonus because	16	young people walking through their village, and					
16	people have friends. They can bring somebody	17	we would take that route. It was delightful.					
17	over, right?	18	And all of a sudden, there's a sign up, private					
18	I really like that. I think that we're	19	property, so we'd have to stop, but I know					
19	on the right track of trying to meet the land	1 1	MR. HAAS: Nobody else does,					
20	use plan that we all set up and worked so hard	20	Mayor.					
21	on. We need it to be marketable. We also need	21	MAYOR ZILKA: But that's really,					
22	to plan for what's next. And you've done that		I think, a good example of a beautiful layout,					
23	both to the south and to the north. And I do	23	and it adds a great deal to the city.					
24	believe that you will have expansions.	24	Every morning when I leave for work, I					
25	I have a couple of questions.	49	drive down Creekside going east, and I look at					

в

Page 70

the gazebo across the street at Tuscan Village, and it is a heck of lot better than the ugly woods that was there, with those ash trees.

And, you know --

CHAIRMAN PLUNKETT: I'd have to agree with that.

MAYOR ZILKA: -- I heard people complaining, All you're doing is tearing down trees, and you're building more -- and they -- their -- 20 years ago, their house was -- you know, their development does the same thing, so that stops it all.

But it really does make a difference, and I think that's what's going to happen here. People aren't necessarily going to walk through there, but it's going to be a calming effect as people will drive by there. It's going to tip the balance from a commercial-looking place with lots of cars and a little bit of confusion sometimes, busy traffic, but that's going to really calm things down.

So as I look at that gazebo, I think people are going to look at that and say, Well, that's really nice. It's going to be a real plus. And I think it does set up potential for

the south of the property someday where that can be extended, and we can see more of this.

I need to address or bring up the issue that Chief Molnar would bring if he were here, and that is the need, perhaps, for a turn lane to be extended further south. And I'm trying to figure out how we might be able to squeeze that in there.

But I think with all of the traffic we have and the commercial entities we have there, we probably need to consider that. And, oh, geez, we've got three more units. But how many more cars does three units generate? Not very many. It's a heck of a lot less that were commercial area, which would get, you know, cars coming and going at a much greater rate, so -- in the longer period of time during the day.

It really is impressive, and I think it's going to be a real asset. These people are going to compliment it because -- people would compliment it because people can go down across the street.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PLUNKETT: Thank you,

Mr. Mayor.

Dr. Ma.

DR. MA: Thank you.

I agree with the comment. I'm not really worried about the increase in units. And I would say the gazebo is lovely.

I agree with Mr. Haas. I don't live that far from here, walk this way. My son even requests to go to the gas station to hang out with his friends. I see them all the time heading down 83 there. In fact, I saw a few coming here every evening, and so I think you're -- you are going to have teenagers. I know the Speedway had to limit the number of teenagers in the store at one time recently. And so I think that could be problematic. I agree they're like -- I don't want to see it go either, so just figuring out what does that -- how does that work in terms of with the community?

MR. GAMELLA: You know, again, that's a good question. It's a fine line. I think, you know, when you look at used -- when I look at -- we're now just at the gazebo at Tuscan Village. We see some folks from

Independence Village stopping there resting, going to the shopping center, or just going over there. We have, you know, folks that will do a morning walk through Tuscan Village and do some e-mailing on the phone or speaking on the phone. And then we have about 2:45 or so when the young adults come out, and it's a whole different flavor.

You know, I have two older granddaughters that are -- you know, they like to go to that part of town, ride their bikes, and, you know, get some nutrition of some sort, and it's a fine line.

But I think, for us, you know, it's a tremendous expenditure. Doug has done a great job. And if we're going to do it, it's going to be done right. I think just for visualization, I think at the end of the day -- and I can understand everybody's comments, the visualization for the city, you know, I get -- when you're sitting at the traffic light and you see the fountain from Towne Center, it just kind of -- as you said, it's just kind of calming. It just gives a nice -- it gives -- I think it accentuates not that we're just a

Page 72

Page 71

Page 74

Page 73

bedroom community, but we're a -- you know, a functioning nice place to live, create some memories, and raise children.

So it's tough because I'm sure — and we have had to, at Dustin Village, you know, daily pick up some debris that's he been left from the dogs. So I'm sure there's going to be some maintenance involved, but we would be under a maintenance contract usually. So that would be part of what we would expect our folks to take care of there with that. But you're right, it is going to be touched by kids.

DR. MA: It is a very trafficked area by then.

I also really like the green space on the north. I think that's a nice add, a really nice space. You know, when you don't have much yard, to have that option to come to it, I think that's really a nice touch. So nice

Thank you.

2.0

CHAIRMAN PLUNKETT: Ms. Raymond. MS. RAYMOND: Thank you.

I agree with everything that has been said tonight. I think that it's a good plan.

I'm sitting here wracking my brain, trying to remember the restrictions that were on it maybe prior, because this is a much better use of the acreage than what you had prior, meaning there was a lot of land left to the north that was not developed, and I think this is just a better use of the acreage.

CHAIRMAN PLUNKETT: I think there was a lot of discussion about whether or not the fire department was going to have access through that or not.

MS. RAYMOND: Yeah. I think that was very limiting to what you could do here, and this is now what you should do. So --

MR. GAMELLA: Thank you. MS. RAYMOND: -- I think it's

great.

MR. GAMELLA: Just moving onto the last part, if we could just maybe get some direction from the commissioner and law director and economic director about what the next steps would be.

MR. ESBORN: If we could, I think -- I was actually just about, you know, to mention because, you know, I don't want to

sort of leave it at this work session as, you know, there are old code/new code questions to answer. I think there was, you know, three primary things that, you know, especially, you know, the law director and I need to work on in the near future here.

One, like we said, is confirming that the current code's alternative equivalency provision can address density. So that's one thing.

The second thing, our code now has, any subdivision over five that -- any subdivision that results in over five parcels is a major subdivision. Now, under the old code, it was something more like if -- you know, if there's a dedicated road for something like that. That was more of the trigger, but now, we kind of have this five-parcel language.

And, you know, the only implication there is that, you know, a major subdivision, you know, it -- you have to have a preliminary plat, and then, you know, the process is a little bit different than what we had under the old code.

So, again, for all of these things, I'm

ard, need

Page 76

Page 75

very positive that we'll find a way forward, but kind of, these are the pieces that we need to figure out.

The third and final one, in the 2019 comprehensive land use plan, the northern half of this site was included in the Towne Center focus area, which, if that had stayed true in the new planning and zoning code, would have made it eligible for greater density.

I think what happened, though, was that this property got rezoned -- the two properties got rezoned in 2020. And when we went to do the planning and zoning code in 2021, we said, Well, we're not going to have the focus area split through this site that now are two, and so they sort of excluded it from the focus area. But, you know, we do have in our sort of key planning document that, you know, part of the site was -- you know, as Mr. Mayor has pointed out, it was sort of intended for larger density.

So, you know, those are the three things that we really need to put together making sure that alternative equivalency covers density, you know, figuring out how to do this major

PH: 216.241.3918

PH: 216.241.3918

Page 78

subdivision process. And then, you know, I think the piece about the comp plan really just kind of works to, you know, the applicant's advantage here because he can point to the comp plan, and, you know, it does make it unique.

So, you know, with that, I don't know, Gary, if you -- you know, anything to say about process from here forward.

MR. EBERT: Well, you and I have talked about these things, as a matter of fact, under the new code to try to make sure that equivalency is being addressed. You know, remember back in April, I think it was 2021 is when we -- I think the first time the planning commission used that provision. And I had done research on it.

And the three main requirements that we're looking at concerning the -- having equivalency, and that was the substantial compliance of the code, number one. Two was a higher quality use of the land, which could be achieved through having equivalency. And, three, whether allowing the development without a strict hold and compliance would have an adverse effect on the surrounding areas. I

think it's just done the opposite based on this situation.

But we've talked as to how that would be implemented under the new code, and that's what we've been working on this week. In fact, as recently as yesterday and this morning, we're talking about it.

So I think what we would do there is come to a conclusion on that and move forward.

MR. ESBORN: Yes.

MR. EBERT: But, you know, as you heard all the people here right now, I mean, it's a better development than before and a better use of the land, and it's really compliant with the equivalency purpose when it was even implemented back in April of 2021.

CHAIRMAN PLUNKETT: Mr. Sayler.
MR. SAYLER: Yeah, Mr. Esborn and
Mr. Ebert did reach out to me. We had -- I was
involved in a couple of these discussions
trying to wrestle with how to fit the new code
versus the old code.

And after we had that conversation, I did a little research, and I was wondering whether either of you had looked at the section of the new code where it allows for modifications or amendments to approve the application. This is in Code Section 1214.01.

MR. EBERT: 1214.01?

MR. SAYLER: Yeah. And it's in -- under the letter OO. It's on page 20 of my code book.

But, basically, it says, Where the code administrator determines that the proposed modification, amendment, or change is not minor, the applicant shall be required to submit an application and payment of additional fee, and the application is to be reviewed in accordance to the procedure and standard established for its original approval.

So this may be a way for us to still keep it under the old code. According to --

MR. EBERT: Yes. You're referring back to the old code. Based on that, you're referring back to the old code.

MR. SAYLER: And I'm wondering if that might make it easier. So if you guys could look at that section of the code and see whether that might be a cleaner way to try to approach this.

MR. ESBORN: Yeah. And I had started thinking about that during this meeting because I think, before, my thinking was, well, it's -- you know, when it got the approval in February of '22, that kind of sealed that. And this is something different.

But as we were discussing it, I was thinking along these lines, too. I mean, maybe this -- maybe it could be considered a modification of an application.

MR. SAYLER: Especially if you consider the fact that, you know, technically -- not just technically, but, in fact, this project has already started construction. They approved the sanitary sewers. They have done some of the storm improvement work. They've done the clearing. They've done the demolition.

So this isn't just a project that, you know, has been laying dormant and, you know, needs to be reviewed. This is actually a project that, I think, has been grandfathered in and the construction has occurred down there.

So, again, with that in mind, I think

Page 80

Page: 20 (77 - 80)

Page 83 Page 81 1 that might give us a little more excuse to use and your thought. So thank you very much. 2 2 that section of code if you feel it's Thank you for allowing us to present. 3 3 appropriate. 4 4 MR. EBERT: I will take a look at (Off-the-record discussion.) 5 5 that. 6 б CHAIRMAN PLUNKETT: We're CHAIRMAN PLUNKETT: 7 7 Ms. Fenderbosch. adjourned. 8 я MS. FENDERBOSCH: Thank you. 9 9 I had -- I think this is a perfect use of (Meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.) 10 10 the new code administrator position. I truly 11 11 do think the interpretation is adequate and 12 12 could be something that I would definitely be 13 13 kind of supporting. 14 14 Thank you. 15 15 CHAIRMAN PLUNKETT: Mr. Mayor. 16 16 MAYOR ZILKA: Yeah. One last 17 17 thing. In this section, which is -- well, this 18 18 isn't going to make much of an impact. But if 19 19 you're driving south on Route 83, just before 20 20 you get to the Public Works' garage, there used 21 21 to be a house with those ugly things in there. 22 22 MR. SAYLER: Uh-huh. 23 23 MAYOR ZILKA: That was removed, 24 24 and they have grass in there. 25 25 And what changed in that whole area? Page 82 Page 84 1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE So it wasn't a big strip of land, but it 2 was something that was ugly that was removed, The State of Ohio, ) 3 and, now, it looks pastoral and pleasant. And SS: 4 I think this might have the same impact in that County of Cuyahoga. ) 5 area. It will just calm things down 6 6 I, Melissa Cruz, a Notary Public within and for psychologically. 7 MR. GAMELLA: Mr. Chairman, with the State of Ohio, duly commissioned and qualified, do 8 hereby certify that the meeting was by me reduced to your permission, if we could continue working 9 stenotypy in the presence of said witness; afterwards on that. 10 10 transcribed, and that the foregoing is a true and And, Gary, we'd like to try to come back 11 correct transcription of the meeting. 11 with maybe some kind of site plan approval 12 12 maybe in July, if that's possible, if we could I do further certify that this meeting was 13 13 try to get some direction. taken at the time and place in the foregoing caption 14 14 specified and was completed without adjournment. MR. EBERT: Sure. 15 15 CHAIRMAN PLUNKETT: Sure. It's 16 16 okay with me. 17 17 MR. EBERT: You-all got to stay 18 18 for the final. 19 19 CHAIRMAN PLUNKETT: Yes. Thank 20 2.0 you for all your presentations here tonight. 21 21 You guys have really done a lot to enhance this 22 22 community. I appreciate you all. 23 23 MR. GAMELLA: Well, thank you for 24 24 all of your comments. They help to where we are today, so I truly appreciate all the time

$\overline{}$			
1	I do further certify that I am not a relative,		
2	counsel or attorney for either party, or otherwise		
3	interested in the event of this action.		
4	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand		
5	and affixed my seal of office at Cleveland, Ohio, on		
6	this 31st day of May, 2023.		
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14	Melissa Cruz, Notary Public		
	within and for the State of Ohio		
16		1	
17	Commission No: 2018-RE-712782		
	My commission expires April 8th, 2028.		
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
		1	
	I and the second		Į.