

Brunswick City Planning Commission

April 1, 2021

6:30 p.m. - Caucus

Joe Shirilla, Chairman
Jeff Arona, Vice Chairman
John Rocha, Recording Secretary
Abbas Hasan, Member
Brad Saeger, Member
Brian Ousley, Council Representative
Matt Jones, Consulting City Engineer
Pamela Plavecski, Planning & Zoning Coordinator
Santo Incorvaia, Assistant Law Director
Grant Aungst, Community & Economic Development Director
Joe Delsanter, Council-at-Large
Dan Armagno, LaBella Associates, 6150, Parkland Blvd., Suite
100, Mayfield Heights
Frank Dascenzo, Select Strategies, 6715 Tippecanoe Road
Building F, Suite 100-B, Canfield
Don Raimondo, The Dog House, 170 Pearl Road, Brunswick
Steve Schill, 1650 Crossings Parkway, Suite E, Westlake

Chairman Joe Shirilla called the meeting to order at 6:35 p.m.

The first item was the review of the public hearing for the text amendment to repeal Section 1266.04(d) pertaining to single-user 40,000 sq. ft. retail businesses in the I-L Light Industrial District. Ms. Plavecski provided background on the proposed legislation. Mr. Aungst stated retail uses should be located in commercial districts.

The second item was the review of the discussion plan for The Dog House restaurant, 170 Pearl Road (in front of Havana's Choice Cigars). Ms. Plavecski noted that modifications are required for the front yard and front yard parking zone setback. Mr. Shirilla stated the Planning Commission should be consistent with the findings required in Section 1260.07(e).

The third item was the review of the revised detailed site plan for Marc's grocery and retail store, 3301 Center Road (former K-Mart). Mr. Shirilla inquired if dimmable lights could be used and about the condition of the existing light poles. Mr. Ousley inquired if this property is in the C-H District concerning the proposed monument sign; Mr. Aungst responded the site is in the C-G District for which a monument sign is allowed.

The fourth item was old business of park fees for Oak Ridge Preserve SPD-7, eastern portion of 834 Pearl Road. The Commission had no comment on this item.

Mr. Shirilla adjourned the meeting at 6:50 p.m.

Respectfully,

Pamela Plavecski

Brunswick City Planning Commission

April 1, 2021

6:51 p.m.

Joe Shirilla, Chairman
Jeff Arona, Vice Chairman
John Rocha, Recording Secretary
Abbas Hasan, Member
Brad Saeger, Member
Brian Ousley, Council Representative
Matt Jones, Consulting City Engineer
Pamela Plavecski, Planning & Zoning Coordinator
Santo Incorvaia, Assistant Law Director
Grant Aungst, Community & Economic Development Director
Joe Delsanter, Council-at-Large
Dan Armagno, LaBella Associates, 6150, Parkland Blvd., Suite
100, Mayfield Heights
Frank Dascenzo, Select Strategies, 6715 Tippecanoe Road
Building F, Suite 100-B, Canfield
Don Raimondo, The Dog House, 170 Pearl Road, Brunswick
Steve Schill, 1650 Crossings Parkway, Suite E, Westlake

Item 1

Chairman Joe Shirilla called the meeting to order at 6:51 p.m.

Ms. Plavecski called the roll: 5 present 0 absent.

Item 2

There were no announcements or correspondence.

Item 3

MR. ARONA MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MARCH 18, 2021.

Mr. Saeger seconded the motion. The vote was 5 Ayes 0 Nays.

Item 4(a)

Regarding the public hearing for the text amendment (Ordinance No. 23-2021) to repeal Section 1266.04(d) pertaining to single-user 40,000 sq. ft. retail businesses in the I-L Light Industrial District, Ms. Plavecski gave an overview of the proposed legislation.

Mr. Aungst explained there is a limited amount of available land left in the I-L District. He stated the Industrial Park businesses don't want "civilian" (non-industrial) traffic. He noted there are some nonconforming uses that have been located there for a while, but industrial use is the best use of the property in the I-L District.

Mr. Shirilla declared the public hearing open; there was no comment, so he declared it closed.

MR. ARONA MOTIONED TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL OF ORDINANCE NO. 23-2021 REPEALING SECTION 1266.04(d) OF THE CODIFIED ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF BRUNSWICK TO ALLOW SINGLE-USER, MINIMUM 40,000 SQ. FT. RETAIL BUSINESSES IN THE I-L LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT AS A CONDITIONALLY PERMITTED USE.

Mr. Saeger seconded the motion. The vote was 5 Ayes 0 Nays.

Item 4(b)

Concerning the discussion plan for The Dog House restaurant, 170 Pearl Road, Mr. Don Raimondo, owner; and Mr. Steve Schill, architect, were present.

Mr. Raimondo explained he wants to have a small diner with indoor and outdoor seating. He noted he purchased the menu rights from Old Fashion Hot Dogs, a 92-year old business in Cleveland that closed, which will now open under the new name of The Dog House. He commented there will be a deck in the front and back of the establishment.

Mr. Shirilla noted the Planning Commission will need to make findings to allow a front yard and front yard parking zone modification.

The Staff Review Comments were addressed as follows:

1. The existing building is located approximately 110' from the Pearl Road right-of-way; Section 1260.05(a)(2)(A) permits a maximum front yard setback of 75' and that two-thirds of the building street façade shall fall within the front yard zone, pursuant to Section 1260.07(a). Also, in accordance with Section 1260.07(b), parking within the front yard zone shall be limited to a maximum width of 45', which has been exceeded. However, Section 1260.07(c) allows the Planning Commission to approve front yards or front yard parking zones greater than the maximum in the following instances:

- (1) An applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Planning Commission that a greater yard is necessary for maneuvering or display for uses such as, without limitation, auto dealers, auto service stations, and garden centers.
- (2) The master plan for the site shows that the negative effect of buildings with more than the maximum front yard will be offset by other buildings included in the master plan that will line the right of way in compliance with the maximum yard.
- (3) An applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Planning Commission that more front yard parking than a single loaded bay is necessary because of the unique characteristics of the business or the site.

Pursuant to Section 1260.07(d), before approving a front yard or front yard parking greater than the maximum, the Planning Commission shall find:

- (1) That the objectives of the Pearl and Center Road Corridor Plan adopted by Ordinance 86-04 will be met, including the vision, goals and preferred characteristics in Chapter 3; and
- (2) That the negative effects of greater building yards, including without limitation the impairment of pedestrian activity and streetscapes visually defined by a “sea of asphalt” will be outweighed by required landscaping and other required site amenities as provided below in Section 1260.07(e).

In accordance with Section 1260.07(e), where the Planning Commission approves a front yard or front yard parking exceeding the maximum, the Planning Commission shall, as part of its findings, require one or more of the following improvements to lessen the negative effects of larger front yards:

- (1) Pedestrian amenities to create a physical and design linkage with the street, including, without limitation, plazas, benches, bike racks and landscaped or covered walkways.
- (2) Structural elements such as walls or decorative metal fencing used to satisfy the purpose and intent of the maximum yard requirement. Such walls or fencing shall be a minimum height of 4 feet, constructed of materials similar to or harmonious with the street facades of nearby buildings, and shall have openings no wider than necessary for vehicles or pedestrians to pass through.
- (3) Landscaping within adjacent parking areas equal to twice the minimum requirements in Section 1282.08(b); a total of 1,280 sq. ft. is required (640 sq. ft. x 2).

Mr. Incorvaia explained a deck is calculated as part of the building setback and read Section 1260.07(e) regarding improvements that need to be provided in order to grant a front yard setback modification. Mr. Saeger commented the adjacent properties to the subject parcel are located in Brunswick Hills, so the Planning Commission has no control in those areas. Ms. Plavecski suggested as there is sufficient room on the site, to ask the applicant to install twice the amount of interior landscaping, pursuant to Section 1260.07(e)(3), in order to grant a modification, to which Mr. Arona and Mr. Hasan agreed. Mr. Jones stated there is approximately 700 sq. ft. of existing flowering trees. Mr. Shirilla suggested installing a concrete walkway up to the deck and adding a radial pattern of pavers where a bistro table could be set up. Mr. Schill and Mr.

Raimondo agreed to adding pavers, along with a picnic table. Mr. Shirilla stated that would fulfill the pedestrian amenities required by Section 1260.07(e)(1).

2. Provide the dimensions of the existing parking spaces and drive aisle width to the west of the proposed restaurant. Table 1276-3 requires a minimum 9' wide by 19' long parking stall dimension and a minimum 24' aisle width for 90° angle parking spaces. Mr. Schill stated he will show this on the detailed site plan. Mr. Jones commented the existing driveway probably needs to be widened.
3. Sheet 1 shows there is an existing septic tank; Mr. Jones noted the applicant shall verify if this site is tied in with the City of Cleveland Division of Water and Medina County Sanitary Engineer systems.
4. A photometrics plan shall be submitted with the detailed site plan, pursuant to Section 1276.14. Mr. Shirilla stated there are several options to provide decorative lighting.
5. The detailed site plan shall include a minimum 640 sq. ft. of interior landscaping, in accordance with Section 1282.08(b)(1), and shall include a minimum of three trees from Plant List "A" and 24 shrubs from Plant Lists "D" or "E", as required by Section 1282.08(b)(2). Ms. Plavecski stated the amount of interior landscaping will double to a minimum of 1,280 sq. ft. if Section 1260.07(e)(3) is used as a condition for a front yard setback modification. Mr. Schill stated they will install radial pavers to fulfill the pedestrian amenities required by Section 1260.07(e)(1) and will install the minimum 640 sq. ft. of interior landscaping required by Section 1282.08(b)(1).
6. Section 1282.08(a) requires a 5' wide parking perimeter screening strip along the north side of the eight new parking spaces, which shall be shown on the detailed site plan.
7. Pursuant to Section 1282.06(e), verify on the detailed site plan that 10% of the total front yard not used for parking or circulation shall be landscaped with trees, shrubs, plantings and/or perennial borders and beds in a design selected by the owner, and shall include a 10' wide parking perimeter landscape strip at the right-of-way. As this is an existing site, the Planning Commission discussed if the above requirements would be applicable to this project. Ms. Plavecski stated, pursuant to Section 1282.10(a), that the Planning Commission could grant a modification.
8. The existing noncompliant ground sign shall be removed and shall comply with Section 1270.05 – Table B. The existing sign was erected without a sign permit or inspections from the Division of Building, which shall be obtained for the new sign.

MR. SAEGER MOTIONED TO MOVE THE DOG HOUSE DISCUSSION PLAN TO A DETAILED SITE PLAN, 170 PEARL ROAD, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING:

1. THE EXISTING BUILDING IS LOCATED APPROXIMATELY 110' FROM THE PEARL ROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY; SECTION 1260.05(a)(2)(A) REQUIRES A MAXIMUM FRONT YARD SETBACK OF 75' AND THAT TWO-THIRDS OF THE BUILDING

STREET FAÇADE SHALL FALL WITHIN THE FRONT YARD ZONE, PURSUANT TO SECTION 1260.07(a). ALSO, IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 1260.07(b), PARKING WITHIN THE FRONT YARD ZONE SHALL BE LIMITED TO A MAXIMUM WIDTH OF 45', WHICH HAS BEEN EXCEEDED. HOWEVER, SECTION 1260.07(c) ALLOWS THE PLANNING COMMISSION TO APPROVE FRONT YARDS OR FRONT YARD PARKING ZONES GREATER THAN THE MAXIMUM, PROVIDED THE REQUIREMENTS IN SECTIONS 1260.07(c), (d) AND (e) HAVE BEEN MET. THE PLANNING COMMISSION HAS FOUND THESE CONDITIONS HAVE BEEN MET AND THAT PEDESTRIAN AMENITIES HAVE BEEN PROVIDED, PURSUANT TO SECTION 1260.07(e)(1), TO CREATE A PHYSICAL AND DESIGN LINKAGE WITH THE STREET WITH THE ADDITION OF A RADIAL PAVER PATIO AND PICNIC BENCH.

2. PROVIDE THE DIMENSIONS OF THE EXISTING PARKING SPACES AND DRIVE AISLE WIDTH TO THE WEST OF THE PROPOSED RESTAURANT. TABLE 1276-3 REQUIRES A MINIMUM 9' WIDE BY 19' LONG PARKING STALL DIMENSION AND A MINIMUM 24' AISLE WIDTH FOR 90° ANGLE PARKING SPACES. ADDITIONALLY, PROVIDE THE DRIVEWAY WIDTH, IN COMPLIANCE WITH TABLE 1276-4, WHICH REQUIRES A MINIMUM 20' WIDTH AT THE RIGHT-OF-WAY AND MINIMUM 30' WIDTH AT THE CURB.
3. SHEET 1 SHOWS THERE IS AN EXISTING SEPTIC TANK; VERIFY IF THIS SITE IS TIED IN WITH THE CITY OF CLEVELAND DIVISION OF WATER AND MEDINA COUNTY SANITARY ENGINEER SYSTEMS.
4. A PHOTOMETRICS PLAN SHALL BE SUBMITTED WITH THE DETAILED SITE PLAN, PURSUANT TO SECTION 1276.14.
5. THE DETAILED SITE PLAN SHALL INCLUDE A MINIMUM 640 SQ. FT. OF INTERIOR LANDSCAPING, IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 1282.08(b)(1), AND SHALL INCLUDE A MINIMUM OF THREE TREES FROM PLANT LIST "A" AND 24 SHRUBS FROM PLANT LISTS "D" OR "E", AS REQUIRED BY SECTION 1282.08(b)(2).
6. SECTION 1282.08(a) REQUIRES A 5' WIDE PARKING PERIMETER SCREENING STRIP ALONG THE NORTH SIDE OF THE EIGHT NEW PARKING SPACES, WHICH SHALL BE SHOWN ON THE DETAILED SITE PLAN.
7. PURSUANT TO SECTION 1282.06(e), VERIFY ON THE DETAILED SITE PLAN THAT 10% OF THE TOTAL FRONT YARD NOT USED FOR PARKING OR CIRCULATION SHALL BE LANDSCAPED WITH TREES, SHRUBS, PLANTINGS AND/OR PERENNIAL BORDERS AND BEDS IN A DESIGN SELECTED BY THE OWNER, AND SHALL INCLUDE A 10' WIDE PARKING PERIMETER LANDSCAPE STRIP AT THE RIGHT-OF-WAY.

8. THE EXISTING NONCOMPLIANT GROUND SIGN SHALL BE REMOVED AND SHALL COMPLY WITH SECTION 1270.05 – TABLE B. THE EXISTING SIGN WAS ERECTED WITHOUT A SIGN PERMIT OR INSPECTIONS FROM THE DIVISION OF BUILDING, WHICH SHALL BE OBTAINED FOR THE NEW SIGN.

Mr. Rocha seconded the motion. The vote was 5 Ayes 0 Nays.

Item 4(c)

Regarding the revised detailed site plan for Marc's grocery and retail store, 3301 Center Road (former K-Mart), Mr. Frank Dascenzo, plaza owner; and Mr. Dan Armagno, LaBella Associates, were present.

Concerning the light poles, Mr. Armagno explained the shorter poles are in the front of the site by Wendy's, with the larger poles in back. He noted this is an existing condition and they will be replacing the fixture heads.

Mr. Shirilla commented the "sea of asphalt" is an existing condition which is being addressed by the addition of the esplanade and new interior landscaping, to which Mr. Arona concurred.

The Staff Review Comments were addressed as follows:

1. The existing building is located approximately 460' from the Center Road right-of-way; Section 1260.05(a)(2)(B) requires a maximum front yard setback of 60' and that two-thirds of the building street façade shall fall within the front yard zone, pursuant to Section 1260.07(a). Also, in accordance with Section 1260.07(b), parking within the front yard zone shall be limited to a maximum width of 45', which has been exceeded. However, Section 1260.07(c) allows the Planning Commission to approve front yards or front yard parking zones greater than the maximum in the following instances:
 - (1) An applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Planning Commission that a greater yard is necessary for maneuvering or display for uses such as, without limitation, auto dealers, auto service stations, and garden centers.
 - (2) The master plan for the site shows that the negative effect of buildings with more than the maximum front yard will be offset by other buildings included in the master plan that will line the right of way in compliance with the maximum yard.
 - (3) An applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Planning Commission that more front yard parking than a single loaded bay is necessary because of the unique characteristics of the business or the site.

Pursuant to Section 1260.07(d), before approving a front yard or front yard parking greater than the maximum, the Planning Commission shall find:

- (1) That the objectives of the Pearl and Center Road Corridor Plan adopted by Ordinance 86-04 will be met, including the vision, goals and preferred characteristics in Chapter 3; and
- (2) That the negative effects of greater building yards, including without limitation the impairment of pedestrian activity and streetscapes visually defined by a

“sea of asphalt” will be outweighed by required landscaping and other required site amenities as provided below in Section 1260.07(e).

In accordance with Section 1260.07(e), where the Planning Commission approves a front yard or front yard parking exceeding the maximum, the Planning Commission shall, as part of its findings, require one or more of the following improvements to lessen the negative effects of larger front yards:

- (1) Pedestrian amenities to create a physical and design linkage with the street, including, without limitation, plazas, benches, bike racks and landscaped or covered walkways. Sheet G100 indicates that a landscaped pedestrian esplanade will be installed through the Marc’s parking lot, along with a walkway to Center Road. Additionally, a bus stop is proposed on Center Road in front of Marc’s for the Medina County Transit.
- (2) Structural elements such as walls or decorative metal fencing used to satisfy the purpose and intent of the maximum yard requirement. Such walls or fencing shall be a minimum height of 4 feet, constructed of materials similar to or harmonious with the street facades of nearby buildings, and shall have openings no wider than necessary for vehicles or pedestrians to pass through.
- (3) Landscaping within adjacent parking areas equal to twice the minimum requirements in Section 1282.08(b); a total of 31,360 sq. ft. is required (15,680 sq. ft. x 2).

2. The height of the existing light poles has been provided as follows: Two 22’ poles; three 25’ poles; one 29’ pole; ten 30’ poles; five 31’ poles; and five 33’ poles. Section 1276.14(e) permits a maximum 25’ height. However, the Planning Commission may approve greater heights upon a showing by the applicant that the additional height complies with both of the following standards:

- A. The additional height is necessary to efficiently illuminate outdoor areas; and
- B. The additional height will have no adverse effect on adjacent properties.

Mr. Shirilla inquired if any changes will be made to the light pole height; Mr. Armagno responded no. He explained if they try to lower the height, the lighting will be spotty. He said they will replace the heads and use motion sensors that could turn off after certain hours, but only on select lights after business hours. Mr. Hasan stated he is satisfied with the existing light pole height, but inquired why the new light heads can’t be dimmable. Mr. Armagno commented the existing lighting can’t handle dimmable fixtures. He said the motion sensors will help with the overall lighting levels, but noted they need sufficient security lighting for the tenants. Mr. Arona stated he is in agreement with granting a modification on the light pole height, provided the motion sensors reduce the overall footcandle level. He stated he lives in close proximity to this plaza and stated there is a definite glow from that area, resulting in light pollution.

3. A revised photometrics plan has been submitted; however, the average illumination level of 2.4 footcandles permitted by Section 1276.14(c) has been exceeded by all of the parking lots, with the exception of the Building “A” side parking lot. Additionally, the Commission requested for the parking lot lights to be dimmable. Mr. Arona

commented the lighting for the overall parking area has an average illumination level of 4.58 footcandles, and suggested it could be reduced by 25% to 3.4 footcandles after business hours. Mr. Shirilla requested that up-lighting should be added to the esplanade, to which Mr. Arona concurred.

The applicant is requesting a modification from the Planning Commission, as the light poles and subsequent footcandle levels are an existing condition. As permitted by Section 1276.15(b), the Planning Commission may modify the specific standards of Chapter 1276 and approve less restrictive parking or site design improvements in individual unique situations where such standards are clearly inapplicable. In modifying any requirement of this Chapter, the Commission shall find that the objectives of this Chapter, as stated in Section 1276.01, will be met, that the intent of the specific requirement will be maintained, and that the public interest will be served. A concurring vote of three members of the Planning Commission shall be required to approve a less restrictive improvement as authorized by this subsection.

Due to a previous commitment, Mr. Shirilla left the meeting at 8:20 p.m. and Mr. Arona took over chairing the meeting.

4. The Fire Department has concerns regarding the location and orientation of the compactor and access to the fire department connection and sprinkler room. In its current configuration, it does not appear that immediate access, as required by Ohio Fire Code Section 509.2 Equipment Access is provided. The proposed drawing shows an opening of 10'4"; the Fire Department is inquiring if an alternative plan is available. Mr. Armagno explained the Fire Department connection will be on the hydrant located at the rear of the building.
5. Final site plan approval is subject to engineering approval.

Regarding the building front façade, Mr. Arona noted there is EIFS going down to grade level. He stated in the past, the Commission has asked for other material since the EIFS gets damaged through snow plowing, etc. Mr. Armagno commented they will protect the building by adding a concrete curb along the entire front façade that will be shown on the engineering plans; Mr. Jones stated that would be a good solution. Mr. Armagno said they will use reinforced EIFS on the bottom of the building.

Mr. Arona confirmed the pharmacy will be for customer walk-up traffic only; there will be no drive-up vehicle traffic. Mr. Aungst stated the Board of Zoning Appeals granted a variance to allow signage for the pharmacy.

Mr. Aungst asked if another dumpster enclosure will be added for metal recycling; Mr. Armagno answered the one they designed will handle both, but there will be more pick-ups.

MR. HASAN MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE REVISED DETAILED SITE PLAN FOR MARC'S, 3301 CENTER ROAD, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING:

1. THE EXISTING BUILDING IS LOCATED APPROXIMATELY 460' FROM THE CENTER ROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY; SECTION 1260.05(a)(2)(B) REQUIRES A MAXIMUM FRONT YARD SETBACK OF 60' AND THAT TWO-THIRDS OF THE BUILDING STREET FAÇADE SHALL FALL WITHIN THE FRONT YARD ZONE, PURSUANT TO SECTION 1260.07(a). ALSO, IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 1260.07(b), PARKING WITHIN THE FRONT YARD ZONE SHALL BE LIMITED TO A MAXIMUM WIDTH OF 45', WHICH HAS BEEN EXCEEDED. HOWEVER, SECTION 1260.07(c) ALLOWS THE PLANNING COMMISSION TO APPROVE FRONT YARDS OR FRONT YARD PARKING ZONES GREATER THAN THE MAXIMUM, PROVIDED THE REQUIREMENTS IN SECTIONS 1260.07(c), (d) AND (e) HAVE BEEN MET. THE PLANNING COMMISSION HAS FOUND THESE CONDITIONS HAVE BEEN MET AND THAT PEDESTRIAN AMENITIES HAVE BEEN PROVIDED, PURSUANT TO SECTION 1260.07(e)(1), TO CREATE A PHYSICAL AND DESIGN LINKAGE WITH THE STREET. SHEET G100 INDICATES THAT A LANDSCAPED PEDESTRIAN ESPLANADE WILL BE INSTALLED THROUGH THE MARC'S PARKING LOT, ALONG WITH A WALKWAY TO CENTER ROAD. ADDITIONALLY, A BUS STOP IS PROPOSED ON CENTER ROAD IN FRONT OF MARC'S FOR THE MEDINA COUNTY TRANSIT, FOR WHICH A BENCH WILL BE PROVIDED.
2. THE HEIGHT OF THE EXISTING LIGHT POLES HAS BEEN INDICATED AS FOLLOWS: TWO 22' POLES; THREE 25' POLES; ONE 29' POLE; TEN 30' POLES; FIVE 31' POLES; AND FIVE 33' POLES. SECTION 1276.14(e) PERMITS A MAXIMUM 25' HEIGHT. AS PERMITTED BY THE ABOVE SECTION, AS THIS IS AN EXISTING CONDITION, AND THERE ARE NO ADJACENT RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES, THE PLANNING COMMISSION HAS APPROVED GREATER HEIGHTS UPON A SHOWING BY THE APPLICANT THAT THE ADDITIONAL HEIGHT COMPLIES WITH BOTH OF THE FOLLOWING STANDARDS:
 - A. THE ADDITIONAL HEIGHT IS NECESSARY TO EFFICIENTLY ILLUMINATE OUTDOOR AREAS; AND
 - B. THE ADDITIONAL HEIGHT WILL HAVE NO ADVERSE EFFECT ON ADJACENT PROPERTIES.
3. A REVISED PHOTOMETRICS PLAN HAS BEEN SUBMITTED; HOWEVER, THE AVERAGE ILLUMINATION LEVEL OF 2.4 FOOTCANDLES PERMITTED BY SECTION 1276.14(c) HAS BEEN EXCEEDED BY ALL OF THE PARKING LOTS, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE BUILDING "A" SIDE PARKING LOT. THE OVERALL PARKING AREA HAS AN AVERAGE ILLUMINATION LEVEL OF 4.58 FOOTCANDLES, WHICH SHALL BE REDUCED BY 25% TO 3.4 FOOTCANDLES AFTER BUSINESS HOURS. THIS SHALL BE ACHIEVED THROUGH THE USE OF MOTION SENSORS OR OTHER MEANS TO REDUCE THE LIGHTING. AS THIS IS AN EXISTING CONDITION, AS PERMITTED BY SECTION 1276.15(b), THE PLANNING COMMISSION MAY MODIFY THE SPECIFIC STANDARDS OF CHAPTER 1276 AND APPROVE LESS RESTRICTIVE PARKING OR SITE DESIGN IMPROVEMENTS IN INDIVIDUAL UNIQUE SITUATIONS WHERE SUCH STANDARDS ARE CLEARLY INAPPLICABLE. IN MODIFYING ANY REQUIREMENT OF THIS CHAPTER, THE COMMISSION HAS FOUND THAT THE

OBJECTIVES OF THIS CHAPTER, AS STATED IN SECTION 1276.01, HAVE BEEN MET, THAT THE INTENT OF THE SPECIFIC REQUIREMENT WILL BE MAINTAINED, AND THAT THE PUBLIC INTEREST WILL BE SERVED.

4. LANDSCAPE UP-LIGHTING WILL BE ADDED TO THE ESPLANADE.
5. THE FIRE DEPARTMENT CONNECTION WILL BE PROVIDED ON THE HYDRANT LOCATED BEHIND THE BUILDING, SUBJECT TO FIRE DEPARTMENT AND ENGINEERING APPROVAL.
6. CURBING WILL BE ADDED TO PROTECT THE BOTTOM OF THE EIFS ON THE FRONT FAÇADE.
7. THE PHARMACY ENTRANCE ON THE WESTERN PORTION OF THE FRONT FAÇADE WILL BE FOR PEDESTRIAN ACCESS ONLY.
8. FINAL SITE PLAN APPROVAL IS SUBJECT TO ENGINEERING APPROVAL.

Mr. Saeger seconded the motion. The vote was 4 Ayes 0 Nays.

Item 5(a)

Regarding old business of the Oak Ridge Preserve SPD-7 park fees, western portion of 834 Pearl Road, no applicant was present. The Planning Commission had no questions or comments on this item.

MR. ROCHA MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE OAK RIDGE PRESERVE SPD-7 PARK FEES AS SUBMITTED, WESTERN PORTION OF 834 PEARL ROAD.

Mr. Hasan seconded the motion. The vote was 4 Ayes 0 Nays.

Item 6

There was no new business.

Item 7

No one appeared at the public comment period.

Item 8

Mr. Ousley gave the Council Representative's Report. He stated there have been resident complaints regarding the Vicky Drive extension subdivision with trees being excessively removed, muddy streets, and construction beginning before 7:00 a.m. Mr. Jones stated QCI is instructed to inform him and the Division of Building if work is being performed prior to 7:00

a.m. Mr. Hasan said part of the Planning Commission's approval is to only remove trees as necessary to construct the development.

MR. ROCHA MOTIONED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING.

Mr. Saeger seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 9:08 p.m.

Respectfully,

Pamela Plavecski

PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

April 1, 2021

Repeal Section 1266.04(d) – retail uses in the I-L District

(Public hearing – text amendment)

Proposed Use & Background:

A text amendment (Ordinance No. 23-2021) has been proposed to the City of Brunswick Codified Ordinances to repeal Section 1266.04(d) in its entirety which currently reads “Single user, retail businesses with a minimum gross floor area of 40,000 square feet, provided, and notwithstanding any other provision of the Brunswick Codified Ordinances, that such uses shall be governed exclusively by the regulations stated and incorporated in Chapter [1258](#) of the Planning and Zoning Code, applicable to uses in the C-H Highway Interchange Commercial District, and not to the regulations stated and incorporated into Chapter [1266](#) of the Planning and Zoning Code, applicable to uses in the I-L Light Industrial District.”

In accordance with the Advance Brunswick Comprehensive Plan 2020 Update, City Council has determined that retail uses are not appropriate in the I-L Light Industrial District.

City Council held their first of three readings on February 22, 2021.

Staff Recommendations:

Staff recommends approval to City Council of the proposed text amendment.

The Dog House

(Discussion site plan)

Location: 170 Pearl Road
C-G District

Proposed Use & Background:

An application has been submitted to convert the existing house in front of Havana’s Choice Cigars into a restaurant that will primarily serve hot dogs.

Eight new parking spaces, including one van-accessible handicap space required by Table 1106.1 and Section 1106.5 of the 2017 Ohio Building Code, will be installed on existing asphalt pavement, for a total of 32 parking spaces (24 existing spaces, including one handicap space by the existing cigar store), in compliance with the minimum 27 spaces required by Table 1276-1(d)(4). The new parking spaces measure 9’ wide by 20’ long, pursuant to Table 1276-3 for 90° angle parking spaces. There will be 20 indoor seats and 12 outdoor seats for the restaurant, along with 10 indoor seats and 12 outdoor seats for the cigar store. A new approximate 350 sq. ft. composite deck will be installed on the east side of the

existing house. A color rendering has been submitted indicating how the proposed deck will blend in with the existing house, as required by Section 1278.08(e).

Staff Review Comments:

1. The existing building is located approximately 110' from the Pearl Road right-of-way; Section 1260.05(a)(2)(A) permits a maximum front yard setback of 75' and that two-thirds of the building street façade shall fall within the front yard zone, pursuant to Section 1260.07(a). Also, in accordance with Section 1260.07(b), parking within the front yard zone shall be limited to a maximum width of 45', which has been exceeded. However, Section 1260.07(c) allows the Planning Commission to approve front yards or front yard parking zones greater than the maximum in the following instances:
 - (1) An applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Planning Commission that a greater yard is necessary for maneuvering or display for uses such as, without limitation, auto dealers, auto service stations, and garden centers.
 - (2) The master plan for the site shows that the negative effect of buildings with more than the maximum front yard will be offset by other buildings included in the master plan that will line the right of way in compliance with the maximum yard.
 - (3) An applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Planning Commission that more front yard parking than a single loaded bay is necessary because of the unique characteristics of the business or the site.

Pursuant to Section 1260.07(d), before approving a front yard or front yard parking greater than the maximum, the Planning Commission shall find:

- (1) That the objectives of the Pearl and Center Road Corridor Plan adopted by Ordinance 86-04 will be met, including the vision, goals and preferred characteristics in Chapter 3; and
- (2) That the negative effects of greater building yards, including without limitation the impairment of pedestrian activity and streetscapes visually defined by a "sea of asphalt" will be outweighed by required landscaping and other required site amenities as provided below in Section 1260.07(e).

In accordance with Section 1260.07(e), where the Planning Commission approves a front yard or front yard parking exceeding the maximum, the Planning Commission shall, as part of its findings, require one or more of the following improvements to lessen the negative effects of larger front yards:

- (1) Pedestrian amenities to create a physical and design linkage with the street, including, without limitation, plazas, benches, bike racks and landscaped or covered walkways.
- (2) Structural elements such as walls or decorative metal fencing used to satisfy the purpose and intent of the maximum yard requirement. Such walls or fencing shall be a minimum height of 4 feet, constructed of materials similar to or harmonious with the street facades of nearby buildings, and shall have openings no wider than necessary for vehicles or pedestrians to pass through.
- (3) Landscaping within adjacent parking areas equal to twice the minimum requirements in Section 1282.08(b); a total of 1,280 sq. ft. is required (640 sq. ft. x 2).

2. Provide the dimensions of the existing parking spaces and drive aisle width to the west of the proposed restaurant. Table 1276-3 requires a minimum 9' wide by 19' long parking stall dimension and a minimum 24' aisle width for 90° angle parking spaces.
3. Sheet 1 shows there is an existing septic tank; verify if this site is tied in with the City of Cleveland Division of Water.
4. A photometrics plan shall be submitted with the detailed site plan, pursuant to Section 1276.14.
5. The detailed site plan shall include a minimum 640 sq. ft. of interior landscaping, in accordance with Section 1282.08(b)(1), and shall include a minimum of three trees from Plant List "A" and 24 shrubs from Plant Lists "D" or "E", as required by Section 1282.08(b)(2).
6. Section 1282.08(a) requires a 5' wide parking perimeter screening strip along the north side of the eight new parking spaces, which shall be shown on the detailed site plan.
7. Pursuant to Section 1282.06(e), verify on the detailed site plan that 10% of the total front yard not used for parking or circulation shall be landscaped with trees, shrubs, plantings and/or perennial borders and beds in a design selected by the owner, and shall include a 10' wide parking perimeter landscape strip at the right-of-way.
8. The existing noncompliant ground sign shall be removed and shall comply with Section 1270.05 – Table B. The existing sign was erected without a sign permit or inspections from the Division of Building, which shall be obtained for the new sign.

Staff Recommendations:

Staff recommends moving the discussion plan to a detailed site plan, pending the front yard building setback and front yard parking zone width modification, and provided the above items are addressed.

Marc's grocery store

(Revised detailed site plan)

Location: 3301 Center Road (former K-Mart) – The Shops at Brunswick Place
C-G District

Proposed Use & Background:

The Planning Commission, at the applicant's request, tabled the detailed site plan at their meeting on December 17, 2020, in order to provide revised façade drawings on the south elevation showing additional architectural enhancements.

A new front (south) façade elevation has been submitted which consists of cream EIFS on the majority of the building, accented with tan EIFS on the entrance columns and eastern end of the structure by Jud's Best Discount Muffler and Brake. Tiered cornices over Marc's entrance doors and a new gray matte pre-finished metal cornice will encompass the black background for the proposed Marc's wall sign. Glass windows have been added west of the entrance doors that will extend to the new pharmacy pick-up window. Brown matte metal columns covered at the base with oak-colored split-face block piers will support the brown metal canopy. Additionally, tan EIFS columns utilizing the above style piers will break up the long expanse of wall, pursuant to Section 1278.08(c).

Façade approval is being requested only for Marc's and Jud's at this time; façade improvements for the future tenant to the west of Marc's will be submitted at a later date. As part of the site plan approval, Marc's is seeking approval of the recessed dock, compactor and generator on the north side of the building, which meets the 25' rear setback required by Section 1260.05(c), along with the 20' aisle width required by the Fire Department. The dock will be constructed out of masonry with the same height as the existing building and will be painted to match the existing building.

Staff Review Comments:

1. The existing building is located approximately 460' from the Center Road right-of-way; Section 1260.05(a)(2)(B) requires a maximum front yard setback of 60' and that two-thirds of the building street façade shall fall within the front yard zone, pursuant to Section 1260.07(a). Also, in accordance with Section 1260.07(b), parking within the front yard zone shall be limited to a maximum width of 45', which has been exceeded. However, Section 1260.07(c) allows the Planning Commission to approve front yards or front yard parking zones greater than the maximum in the following instances:
 - (1) An applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Planning Commission that a greater yard is necessary for maneuvering or display for uses such as, without limitation, auto dealers, auto service stations, and garden centers.
 - (2) The master plan for the site shows that the negative effect of buildings with more than the maximum front yard will be offset by other buildings included in the master plan that will line the right of way in compliance with the maximum yard.
 - (3) An applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Planning Commission that more front yard parking than a single loaded bay is necessary because of the unique characteristics of the business or the site.

Pursuant to Section 1260.07(d), before approving a front yard or front yard parking greater than the maximum, the Planning Commission shall find:

- (1) That the objectives of the Pearl and Center Road Corridor Plan adopted by Ordinance 86-04 will be met, including the vision, goals and preferred characteristics in Chapter 3; and
- (2) That the negative effects of greater building yards, including without limitation the impairment of pedestrian activity and streetscapes visually defined by a "sea of asphalt" will be outweighed by required landscaping and other required site amenities as provided below in Section 1260.07(e).

In accordance with Section 1260.07(e), where the Planning Commission approves a front yard or front yard parking exceeding the maximum, the Planning Commission shall, as part of its findings, require one or more of the following improvements to lessen the negative effects of larger front yards:

- (1) Pedestrian amenities to create a physical and design linkage with the street, including, without limitation, plazas, benches, bike racks and landscaped or covered walkways. Sheet G100 indicates that a landscaped pedestrian esplanade will be installed through the Marc's parking lot, along with a walkway to Center Road. Additionally, a bus stop is proposed on Center Road in front of Marc's for the Medina County Transit.
- (2) Structural elements such as walls or decorative metal fencing used to satisfy the purpose and intent of the maximum yard requirement. Such walls or fencing shall be a minimum height of 4 feet, constructed of materials similar to or harmonious with the street facades of nearby buildings, and shall have openings no wider than necessary for vehicles or pedestrians to pass through.
- (3) Landscaping within adjacent parking areas equal to twice the minimum requirements in Section 1282.08(b); a total of 31,360 sq. ft. is required (15,680 sq. ft. x 2).

2. The height of the existing light poles has been provided as follows: Two 22' poles; three 25' poles; one 29' pole; ten 30' poles; five 31' poles; and five 33' poles. Section 1276.14(e) permits a maximum 25' height. However, the Planning Commission may approve greater heights upon a showing by the applicant that the additional height complies with both of the following standards:

- C. The additional height is necessary to efficiently illuminate outdoor areas; and
- D. The additional height will have no adverse effect on adjacent properties.

3. A revised photometrics plan has been submitted; however, the average illumination level of 2.4 footcandles permitted by Section 1276.14(c) has been exceeded by all of the parking lots, with the exception of the Building "A" side parking lot. Additionally, the Commission requested for the parking lot lights to be dimmable. The applicant is requesting a modification from the Planning Commission, as the light poles and subsequent footcandle levels are an existing condition. As permitted by Section 1276.15(b), the Planning Commission may modify the specific standards of Chapter 1276 and approve less restrictive parking or site design improvements in individual unique situations where such standards are clearly inapplicable. In modifying any requirement of this Chapter, the Commission shall find that the objectives of this Chapter, as stated in Section 1276.01, will be met, that the intent of the specific requirement will be maintained, and that the public interest will be served. A concurring vote of three members of the Planning Commission shall be required to approve a less restrictive improvement as authorized by this subsection.
4. The Fire Department has concerns regarding the location and orientation of the compactor and access to the fire department connection and sprinkler room. In its current configuration, it does not appear that immediate access, as required by Ohio

Fire Code Section 509.2 Equipment Access is provided. The proposed drawing shows an opening of 10'4"; the Fire Department is inquiring if an alternative plan is available.

5. Final site plan approval is subject to engineering approval.

Staff Recommendations:

Staff recommends approval of the detailed site plan, pending the Planning Commission's ruling on the light pole heights and footcandle level modification, and provided the above items are addressed.

Oak Ridge Preserve SPD-7

(Park fees)

Location: east side of 834 Pearl Road
SPD-7

Proposed Use & Background:

The Planning Commission, at their meeting on February 18, 2021, approved the detailed site plan for Oak Ridge Preserve Special Planning District No. 7 (SPD-7), on approximately 12.9258 acres of the eastern portion of 834 Pearl Road, but park fee calculations were not included in the application. The fees have now been submitted, whereby an amount of \$1,129.59 will be included with each building permit fee.

Staff Recommendations:

Staff recommends approval of the park fees.