

Brunswick City Planning Commission

June 2, 2022 - Caucus

6:30 p.m.

Brad Saeger, Vice Chairman  
John Rocha, Recording Secretary  
Jeff Arona, Member  
Abbas Hasan, Member  
Brandon Lambert, Council Representative  
Matt Jones, Consulting City Engineer  
Pamela Plavecski, Planning & Zoning Coordinator  
Dennis Nevar, Law Director's Office  
Grant Aungst, Community & Economic Development Director  
Nick Hanek, Ward 2 Councilman  
Jennie Lods, Board of Zoning Appeals Secretary  
Kelley Grospitch, Intern for Community Development  
Thom Sutcliffe, Drees Homes, 6860 W. Snowville Road,  
Suite 105, Brecksville  
Nicholas Kyriazis, Ergotech Development Group, 2185  
Southpointe Trail, Brunswick Hills (home address)  
Necol Washington, Ergotech (no address given)  
Travis Crane, Davey Resource Group, 1310 Sharon Copley Rd,  
Sharon Center  
Tom Ludwig, Davey Resource Group, same  
Jason Mould, EMD Studio, 34899 Lorain Road, North Ridgeville  
Cindy Wargo, 4195 Arlington Drive, Brunswick

Vice Chairman Brad Saeger called the meeting to order at 6:33 p.m.

The first item was the review of the detailed site plan for Baby Land Academy daycare center, 1656 Pearl Road. The Commission reviewed the Staff Review Comments and had no concerns regarding the project.

The second item was the review of the revised discussion plan for the Market 42 SPD-8 rezoning, conceptual plan, and development guidelines, 2099 and 2105 Pearl Road. Mr. Arona commented it should be stipulated in the development guidelines that the walking path will be public, not private. He also stated the permissible uses in the commercial portion of the development guidelines should be more specific. Mr. Arona read three suggestions from Chairman Shirilla's email dated June 1, 2022, as he was unable to attend tonight's meeting, concerning the residential portion of the development as follows: add four or five parking spaces in the cul-de-sac; have a certain percentage of the front elevation of the paired villas covered with natural materials, such as cultured stone; and that the exposed wall or block on the basement exterior walls should be brick to grade, or an equivalent.

Mr. Saeger adjourned the meeting at 6:40 p.m.

Respectfully,

Pamela Plavecski

Brunswick City Planning Commission

June 2, 2022

6:42 p.m.

Brad Saeger, Vice Chairman  
John Rocha, Recording Secretary  
Jeff Arona, Member  
Abbas Hasan, Member  
Brandon Lambert, Council Representative  
Matt Jones, Consulting City Engineer  
Pamela Plavecski, Planning & Zoning Coordinator  
Dennis Nevar, Law Director's Office  
Grant Aungst, Community & Economic Development Director  
Nick Hanek, Ward 2 Councilman  
Jennie Lods, Board of Zoning Appeals Secretary  
Kelly Grospitch, Intern for Community Development  
Thom Sutcliffe, Drees Homes, 6860 W. Snowville Road,  
Suite 105, Brecksville  
Tony Svoboda, Drees Homes, same as above  
Nicholas Kyriazis, Ergotech Development Group, 2185  
Southpointe Trail, Brunswick Hills (home address)  
Necol Washington, Ergotech Development Group (no address  
given)  
Travis Crane, Davey Resource Group, 1310 Sharon Copley Rd,  
Sharon Center  
Tom Ludwig, Davey Resource Group, same as above  
Jason Mould, EMD Studio, 34899 Lorain Road, North Ridgeville  
Cindy Wargo, 4195 Arlington Drive, Brunswick  
Don Cepek, 2035 Glenmont Drive, Brunswick  
Roland Schama, 4221 Arlington Drive, Brunswick  
Robert Barna, 4115 Arlington Drive, Brunswick  
Clifford Schnear, 4307 Arlington Drive, Brunswick  
Ingrid Kramer, 4260 Shalbey Trail, Brunswick  
Ronald Sabo, 2003 Glenmont Drive, Brunswick  
Sandra Macre, 4215 Cherryshire Drive, Brunswick  
Paul Meincke, 2133 Josephine Boulevard, Brunswick  
Joseph Pronik, 4217 Sleepy Hollow Road, Brunswick

Item 1

Vice Chairman Brad Saeger called the meeting to order at 6:42 p.m.

MR. SAEGER MOTIONED TO EXCUSE CHAIRMAN JOE SHIRILLA FOR JUST CAUSE.

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

Ms. Plavecski called the roll: 4 Present 1 Absent (Mr. Shirilla).

#### Item 2

Regarding announcements or correspondence, Ms. Plavecski announced Mr. Dennis Nevar, from the Law Director's Office, will be filling in tonight for Assistant Law Director Santo Incorvaia. She also introduced Mrs. Jenny Lods, Board of Zoning Appeals Secretary, and Ms. Kelly Grospitch, college intern for the Community Development Department.

#### Item 3

MR. ROCHA MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MAY 19, 2022.

Mr. Hasan seconded the motion. The vote was 3 Ayes 0 Nays 1 Abstain (Mr. Arona).

#### Item 4(a)

Regarding the detailed site plan for Baby Land Academy daycare center, 1656 Pearl Road, Mr. Jason Mould, from EMD Studio, was present.

The Staff Review Comments were addressed as follows:

1. The applicant justified the need for three driveways on Pearl Road at the April 21<sup>st</sup> meeting and shall indicate the proposed traffic pattern for drop-off and pick-up of children on the site plan. Mr. Mould explained there is a staggered time period for the pick-up and drop-off of children; therefore, Mr. Jones stated a separate site plan with traffic arrows is unnecessary.
2. Verify the shrubs in the 10' wide screening strip along the Pearl Road right-of-way will be planted 3' to 4' on-center, pursuant to Section 1282.06(g). Regarding interior landscaping, five shrubs from Plant Lists D or E shall be added to the 19 shrubs shown on Sheet A2.0, or verify there are existing shrubs, to comply with the minimum 24 shrubs required by Section 1282.08(b)(2). Mr. Mould stated he would show this on the final site plan.
3. A photometrics plan has been submitted, pursuant to Section 1276.14(a), indicating a minimum 0.6 footcandle lighting level for parking and pedestrian areas; however, the average illumination level of 3.7 footcandles exceeds the maximum 2.4 footcandles permitted by Section 1276.14(c). Mr. Mould commented he will reduce the average illumination level to comply with Code.
4. As a demolition plan was not submitted, clarify if the existing stairs between the two buildings are being eliminated; if not being removed, the stairs shall be shown on the

detailed site plan. Mr. Mould stated the existing stairs will be removed, and the walk will be used only by employees.

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

MR. ARONA MOTIONED TO APPROVE THE BABY LAND ACADEMY DAYCARE CENTER DETAILED SITE PLAN, 1656 PEARL ROAD, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING:

1. THE APPLICANT JUSTIFIED THE NEED FOR THREE DRIVEWAYS ON PEARL ROAD AT THE APRIL 21<sup>ST</sup> MEETING. AS THERE IS A STAGGERED TIME PERIOD FOR DROP-OFF AND PICK-UP OF CHILDREN, THE DETAILED SITE PLAN SUBMITTED IS SUFFICIENT.
2. INDICATE THAT THE SHRUBS IN THE 10' WIDE SCREENING STRIP ALONG THE PEARL ROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY WILL BE PLANTED 3' TO 4' ON-CENTER, PURSUANT TO SECTION 1282.06(g). REGARDING INTERIOR LANDSCAPING, FIVE SHRUBS FROM PLANT LISTS D OR E SHALL BE ADDED TO THE 19 SHRUBS SHOWN ON SHEET A2.0, OR VERIFY THERE ARE EXISTING SHRUBS, TO COMPLY WITH THE MINIMUM 24 SHRUBS REQUIRED BY SECTION 1282.08(b)(2).
3. THE PHOTOMETRICS PLAN SHALL BE REVISED IN ORDER FOR THE AVERAGE ILLUMINATION LEVEL TO COMPLY WITH THE MAXIMUM 2.4 FOOTCANDLES PERMITTED BY SECTION 1276.14(c).
4. THE EXISTING STAIRS BETWEEN THE TWO BUILDINGS ARE BEING REMOVED AND THE AREA WILL BE LANDSCAPED. THE CONNECTION BETWEEN THE TWO BUILDINGS IS FOR STAFF ONLY AND WILL BE FROM THE LOWER LEVEL OF THE NORTH BUILDING TO THE SOUTH BUILDING.
5. FINAL SITE PLAN APPROVAL IS SUBJECT TO ENGINEERING APPROVAL.

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

#### Item 4(b)

Concerning the revised discussion plan for the Market 42 SPD-8 rezoning, conceptual plan, and development guidelines, 2099 and 2105 Pearl Road, Mr. Nick Kyriazis and Ms. Necol Washington, of Ergotech Development Group; Mr. Travis Crane and Mr. Tom Ludwig, of Davey Resource Group; and Mr. Thom Sutcliffe and Mr. Tony Svoboda, of Drees Homes, were present.

Mr. Nevar commented the petition submitted by Ms. Cindy Wargo has been entered into the record, but noted there are no signatures or addresses on it, and some of the names are from people that live outside of Brunswick and out of Ohio.

The Staff Review Comments were addressed as follows:

1. Section 1268.05(a) requires a minimum site of ten acres; however, the Planning Commission and City Council may consider areas of less than ten acres if they determine the proposed SPD is necessary to achieve the purposes in Section 1268.01 as follows:
  - (a) To regulate the development and use of property in areas throughout the City that contain sensitive or unique environmental, historic, architectural, or other features which require additional protections and flexibility not provided through the application of the Zoning Code;
  - (b) To promote creative and sensitive site planning;
  - (c) To provide for a greater range or mixture of compatible uses than would be allowable in the standard zoning districts of this Code, while also requiring features that protect against negative impacts of incompatible land uses or harm to the environment;
  - (d) To provide an effective method for the City to guide the development of such areas so as to preserve unique characteristics or to provide for the greater range or mixture of land uses when appropriate; and
  - (e) To create a regulatory structure which will allow more flexible and creative design of the built environment, within the limits of the approved conceptual development plan, than is possible with the lot-by-lot design approach of a conventional zoning district.

Mr. Ludwig explained proposed SPD-8 will protect the wetlands on the site and this property has an unusual lot configuration. He said they are trying to create a mixed-use development of residential and retail uses, and they feel this development will be a compatible use in the Pearl Road Corridor and surrounding neighborhood. Mr. Ludwig commented the Comprehensive Plan suggests more townhomes to provide a greater variety of housing. He noted an SPD will allow the Planning Commission more regulation as to how the property will be developed.

2. The Planning Commission, pursuant to Section 1268.01 as stated above, shall determine if the purpose of a Special Planning District has been met, and that one or more of the following conditions listed in Section 1268.05(c) below exist within the proposed SPD:
  1. A concentration of existing or proposed retail, service or industrial establishments serving as a business activity center for the community.
  2. Land that is occupied by substantial natural characteristics worthy of preservation or which are historic aids to the identification of residential communities.
  3. Lands which call for ingenuity and imagination by site designers and developers in keeping with overall land use and open space objectives of the Comprehensive Plan, while departing from the strict application of use, setback, height, lot size and related requirements.

Mr. Ludwig reiterated this will be combination of retail and residential development, and the farmers market will provide a business hub, whereby connecting community assets.

3. Provide the cul-de-sac length of the Glenmont Drive extension in proposed SPD-8; Section 1228.02(d) of the Subdivision Regulations states streets designed to be permanently dead ended shall not be longer than 600 feet, unless a greater length is approved by the Planning Commission, and shall be provided, at the closed end, with a turnaround having an outside pavement diameter of at least 100 feet and a street property line diameter of at least 120 feet. Mr. Ludwig stated the cul-de-sac length is 680 feet, which is needed to go up to Shalbey Trail.
4. Pursuant to Section 1268.02, the rezoning, conceptual plan and development guidelines are subject to City Council approval, for which a public hearing is required, in accordance with Section 1268.06(b) of the Zoning Code and City Charter Section 6.02.

Mr. Arona inquired about on-street parking within the residential portion of the development; Mr. Jones responded it will be similar to The Preserve at Meadow View. He recommended having fire hydrants on the south side of the street, but said it is too early to be determined. Mr. Ludwig stated there will be a 7-1/2% street slope on the Glenmont Drive extension, and noted Sublots 1 and 2 will be smaller units to accommodate the 45' buffer. Mr. Jones explained there are wetlands on the property and most of the high-quality wetlands between the homes and the commercial portion of the development will be preserved. He further commented that water run-off must comply with the city's stormwater management requirements.

Concerning the number of units, Mr. Sutcliffe explained they reduced the density whereby no fourplexes are being constructed in this development. He also stated they are giving a permanent easement to West Creek Conservancy. Mr. Jones noted a 7-1/2% grade is within the allowable range for residential streets and Shalbey Trail has a similar grade. Mr. Crane commented it is not unusual to see a 10% grade in a city.

Mr. Saeger asked if eighteen units are necessary to support the farmers market; Mr. Sutcliffe responded yes. Mr. Saeger and Mr. Jones noted an SPD allows for the most protection of the wetlands. Mr. Arona suggested that the pathway will remain for public use; not private, and this condition should be added to the development guidelines.

Mr. Saeger read an email from Jeff Lynn dated May 30, 2022 (homeowner on Glenmont Drive at the end of the street stub), stating he and his wife are in favor of the development, as a revised site plan was submitted moving the paired villas further away from the existing homes on Glenmont Drive and Shalbey Trail, in addition to providing for more common open space.

As there were numerous members in the audience that wished to express their opinion on the Market 42 project, Mr. Saeger declared the public comment period open.

Councilman Nick Hanek, Ward 2 and President of City Council, explained it is the burden of the developer to justify why they need 18 homes, but financial cost cannot be taken into consideration. He stated residents are concerned about traffic impact on the existing neighborhood. Mr. Hanek asked the Planning Commission to consider if there are too many units proposed and the traffic impact on the surrounding neighborhoods.

Ms. Cindy Wargo, 4195 Arlington Drive, Brunswick, commented the proposed development is too heavily weighted toward the developer. She said there are too many homes and there is not enough protection for the residents. She said the paired villas should look similar to the cluster homes on Arlington Drive; not like the high-density development of The Reserve at Autumn Creek. She stated she would like West Creek Conservancy to review the site plan to ensure the wetlands and residents are protected.

Mr. Roland Schama, 4221 Arlington Drive, Brunswick, stated there will be increased traffic and it is difficult to make a left-hand turn from Arlington Drive heading south to Medina. He suggested installing a traffic light at the intersection of Pearl Road and Arlington Drive to assist with traffic at the Ridgeline Chase subdivision across Pearl Road. He also suggested direct access to Pearl Road for this residential portion of the Market 42 project.

Mr. Robert Barna, 4115 Arlington Drive, Brunswick, stated there is too much traffic on Pearl Road. He asked where the sidewalks will be located and said the Glenmont Drive extension will require city services, which are already overburdened. He stated the development is not feasible; there are too many homes. He further commented the city doesn't need another farmers market.

Mr. Don Cepek, 2035 Glenmont Drive, asked where is the city going to be in five to ten years, as there will be increased traffic and every swatch of property is being developed. He also said the number of units should be reduced.

Joseph Pronik, 4217 Sleepy Hollow Road, Brunswick, stated he was concerned about the number of houses and wanted to ensure they don't get flooded.

Mr. Clifford Schnear, 4307 Arlington Drive, Brunswick, asked where the emergency access will be from the development.

Ms. Ingrid Kramer, 4260 Shalbey Trail, Brunswick, commented the boardwalk will be in her backyard with people walking past her window; she said 50' is not that far from her property line. She also commented there will be garbage from the farmers market blowing into her yard and who will be responsible to clean it up.

Mr. Ronald Sabo, 2003 Glenmont Drive, Brunswick, asked what the grade is on Cherryshire Drive. He stated there is no emergency access and the grade is too high. He said there are no sidewalks. He asked how many variances will be required to develop this property and inquired where are the trees on the lots. He commented he didn't think a farmers market will work out.



Sandra Macre, 4215 Cherryshire Drive, Brunswick, commented all the construction equipment will go past their house and the roads will be damaged. She said currently the mail trucks and snow plows can't make it up the street, due to the grade.

Mr. Paul Meincke, 2133 Josephine Boulevard, Brunswick, stated the city only allows 20% lot coverage and wanted to know the percent of lot coverage for the proposed residential lots. He asked about the traffic pattern for construction trucks.

There was no further public comment, so Mr. Saeger declared the public comment period closed.

Mr. Jones addressed the public comment concerns as follows:

1. The wetlands are required to be protected, which will be written into the development guidelines, and noted West Creek Conservancy will take over the care of the wetlands.
2. A traffic study was performed at the intersection of Arlington Drive and Pearl Road when the Ridgeline Chase subdivision was proposed; the study deemed a traffic light wasn't warranted at that time.
3. He said a direct connection to Pearl Road for the residential development would require elimination of wetlands.
4. Concerning flooding, any development must meet city standards; peak flows have to be reduced, which will help reduce flooding.
5. Regarding a second emergency access, Ridgeline Chase has 77 homes; Medina County requires that any subdivision with more than 50 homes must have a second form of egress. As only 18 homes are proposed, a second form of egress is not required.
6. Sidewalks are being constructed; they are only being eliminated on the north side of one section of the street in order to shift the homes further south. He explained maintenance of public sidewalks is the responsibility of the homeowners' association and West Creek Conservancy.
7. Construction traffic cannot be avoided, as there is only one entrance to the subdivision. A photo will be taken of the roads prior to construction; if any damage is done, the developer will be responsible to repair it.
8. He stated the sanitary sewers are the responsibility of the Medina County Sanitary Engineer's Office.

Mr. Ludwig stated they will provide screening for the boardwalk, to which Ms. Plavecski stated that should be added to the development guidelines. Mr. Saeger asked if there is a significant grade change between the backyard and the boardwalk; Mr. Ludwig replied there is at least an 8' drop.

In response to Mr. Pronik's comment, Mr. Saeger suggested planting some trees adjacent to that property on Sleepy Hollow Road, to which Mr. Ludwig agreed.

Revisions to the development guidelines as recommended by the independent consultant:

1. Minimum building envelope widths and depths should be added (insert in Section D). Additionally, Section D(3)(a) states building envelopes shall be located 20' from the SPD-8 boundary; however, the conceptual plan indicates a 15' separation. Consistency should be provided between the development guidelines and conceptual plan.
2. A minimum 200 sq. ft. of private outdoor space, with minimum dimensions of 10', shall be provided (add to Section E) to allow residents flexibility in the manner for which the outdoor spaces are designed and used.
3. In order to accommodate supplementary parked and stopped vehicles, and to allow for a clear path for emergency vehicle access, recommend limiting parking on one side of the street or a designated area, and no parking on the cul-de-sacs (add to Section E).
4. In order to ensure the sides and rear of the paired villas will be attractive, add the language "Structures shall use offsets, projections, recesses and other comparable design elements to avoid long, uninterrupted wall or roof planes, and a variety of textures and materials will be used to add interest and character." (This language is consistent with development standards in The Preserve at Meadow View SPD-6 and Oak Ridge Preserve SPD-7 and should be added to Section E).
5. In order to prevent garage-prominent dwellings ("snout houses"), add "The garage door shall be a maximum of 2' forward (toward the primary access street) of either the front wall of the main living area, if there is no covered porch; or the front porch line, provided the porch is both covered with a roof and has a concrete frost depth foundation. In no instance shall the garage door be more than 6' in front of the main living area." (This language is used in Section 1284.06(j)(1) for single family cluster development and should be added to Section E(3)(e) of the development guidelines).
6. Concerning landscaping, with a 4' width between the sidewalk and the street, the independent consultant does not recommend adding street trees, though provisions in the development guidelines should be made to make the street and front yards attractive. He suggests planting trees of a smaller species with careful spacing between the house and sidewalk, along with other landscape elements, which should be added to the development guidelines. Provide additional details around the placement of new trees to maintain the buffers and natural feel of the site, i.e. size, species, locations and numbers (add to Section E).
7. Further details for Sections F, G and H regarding Commercial Uses; Commercial Density, Separation and Floor Area Requirements; and Commercial Development Standards, respectively, shall be provided.

The above comments have been added to the revised development guidelines.

The Commission suggested adding to Section E that there will be no street trees, but trees shall be planted between the house and the sidewalk in each yard, in addition to having a yard light.

Mr. Arona commented he appreciated the applicant moving the paired villas further south, but thought the development looked overly weighted on the south side. He suggested removing two units and spreading out the remaining units. Ms. Plavecski noted that 30% common open space has been provided. She also suggested that the requirement to add screening by the boardwalk should be added to the development guidelines, to which the Planning Commission agreed. Mr. Sutcliffe noted the paired villas are designed for empty-nesters and young professionals.

MR. HASAN MOTIONED TO MOVE THE MARKET 42 DEVELOPMENT FOR THE REZONING, CONCEPTUAL PLAN, AND DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES TO A PUBLIC HEARING. THE APPLICANT HAS REVISED THE DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES TO INCLUDE ITEMS 1 THROUGH 7 OF THE STAFF REVIEW COMMENTS SUGGESTED BY DOUG HARSANY (INDEPENDENT CONSULTANT). REVISIONS SUGGESTED TONIGHT SHALL ALSO BE ADDED TO THE DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES. FURTHERMORE, TREES SHALL BE PLANTED TO SCREEN THE BOARDWALK FROM THE NEIGHBORS TO THE NORTH. ADDITIONALLY, THE COMMERCIAL PERMITTED USES SHALL BE REVISED TO BE MORE SPECIFIC.

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

Item 5

There was no old business.

Item 6

There was no new business.

Item 7

Regarding the public comment period, Ms. Cindy Wargo, 4195 Arlington Drive, Brunswick, reiterated her statements from earlier tonight stating the density is too high and there are too many houses.

Item 8

Mr. Lambert stated there was no Council Representative's Report at this time.

MR. ROCHA MOTIONED TO ADJOURN THE MEETING.

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

The meeting was adjourned at 9:53 p.m.

Respectfully,

Pamela Plavecski

## PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

June 2, 2022

### **Baby Land Academy daycare center**

(Detailed site plan)

Location: 1656 Pearl Road  
C-G District

#### **Proposed Use & Background:**

The Planning Commission, at their meeting on April 21, 2022, moved the discussion plan to a detailed site plan to renovate the existing approximate 4,528 sq. ft. building into a daycare center. Interior renovations are being performed with no added foundation area to the structure; however, a 1,540 sq. ft. detached pavilion will be constructed. Two parcels will be consolidated into one property (Parcel Nos. 003-18C-04-087 and 003-18C-04-088).

Concerning landscaping, the species, height, and tree caliper in the 10' wide screening strip along the Pearl Road right-of-way meet the requirements of Section 1282.06(g).

Staff review comments from the April 21<sup>st</sup> meeting have been addressed as follows:

1. The existing building is located 96.04' from the Pearl Road right-of-way; Section 1260.05(a)(2)(A) requires a maximum front yard setback of 75', and Section 1260.07(a) requires that 2/3's of the building's street façade shall fall within the front yard zone established above. Additionally, the front yard parking zone width of 72' exceeds the maximum 45' width permitted by Section 1260.07(b). As the additional front yard setback and front yard parking zone width are needed for the safe and effective circulation of traffic within the front yard, the Planning Commission has granted a modification, as permitted by Section 1260.07(c), to allow the above existing front yard setback and front yard parking zone width to remain, and that the requirements of Section 1260.07(d) and (e) have been met, whereby 2,700 sq. ft. of interior landscaping has been provided, where a minimum of 1,320 sq. ft. is required.
2. The Pearl Road driveway widths at the curb for the center and southern drive of 34.17' and 40.36', respectively, meet the 30' minimum and 45' maximum width required by Table 1276-4; and the northern-most drive has been revised to a 30' width. Additionally, the width for the above driveways at the Pearl Road right-of-way has been provided: 24.67' for the northern drive; 24.52' for the center drive; and 24' for the southern drive, in accordance with the minimum 20' required.
3. Pedestrian access has been provided from the building to Pearl Road, as required by Section 1278.09(d), by installing a 5' wide walkway.

4. The applicant has provided an enhancement to the front (east) façade using manufactured stone veneer similar to the base of the front columns that extends from grade to the horizontal window mullion.
5. A Minor Subdivision application and fee to consolidate the two parcels has been submitted to the Division of Planning, subject to engineering approval.

**Staff Review Comments:**

1. The applicant justified the need for three driveways on Pearl Road at the April 21<sup>st</sup> meeting and shall indicate the proposed traffic pattern for drop-off and pick-up of children on the site plan.
2. Verify the shrubs in the 10' wide screening strip along the Pearl Road right-of-way will be planted 3' to 4' on-center, pursuant to Section 1282.06(g). Regarding interior landscaping, five shrubs from Plant Lists D or E shall be added to the 19 shrubs shown on Sheet A2.0, or verify there are existing shrubs, to comply with the minimum 24 shrubs required by Section 1282.08(b)(2).
3. A photometrics plan has been submitted, pursuant to Section 1276.14(a), indicating a minimum 0.6 footcandle lighting level for parking and pedestrian areas; however, the average illumination level of 3.7 footcandles exceeds the maximum 2.4 footcandles permitted by Section 1276.14(c).
4. As a demolition plan was not submitted, clarify if the existing stairs between the two buildings are being eliminated; if not being removed, the stairs shall be shown on the detailed site plan.
5. Final site plan approval is subject to engineering approval.

**Staff Recommendations:**

Staff recommends approval of the detailed site plan, provided the above items are addressed.

**Market 42 SPD-8**

(Revised discussion plan)

Location: 2099 and 2105 Pearl Road  
Existing C-G, GW-C, and R-L Districts

**Proposed Use & Background:**

At their meeting on April 21, 2022, per the applicant's request, the Planning Commission tabled the discussion plan to rezone existing Permanent Parcel Nos. 003-18D-19-008 consisting of 7.229 acres in the C-G General Commercial District and R-L Low Density Residential District (2099 Pearl Road), and 003-18D-24-001 measuring approximately 1 acre in the GW-C Gateway Commercial District (2105 Pearl Road), for a total of 8.1934 acres, to

create Special Planning District No. 8. This will be a mixed-use development consisting of a 25,610 sq. ft. commercial marketplace building and eighteen residential paired (attached/detached 2-unit) villas. Pursuant to Section 1268.02, a conceptual development plan and development guidelines have been submitted.

To address Planning Commission and neighbor concerns mentioned at the April 21<sup>st</sup> meeting, the site plan has been revised to provide more open space between the paired villas on the Glenmont Drive extension and the existing homes on Glenmont Drive and Shalbey Trail. Paired Sublots 3 and 4 have been split into two separate detached units and shifted further south, whereby Sublot 3 will be located on the west side of the Glenmont Drive extension, and Sublot 4 will be located on the east side of this street near the former location of Sublots 5 and 6. This revision results in Sublots 5 and 6 being relocated south of the open space area, near the east side of Sublot 7. Also, Sublots 1 and 2 have been moved further south to provide more common open space.

The above reconfiguration of lots has increased the amount of residential common open space from 1.38 acres to 1.42 acres, and has reduced the amount of commercial open space from 1.01 acres to 0.98 acre, for a total of 2.4 acres; 30% common open space for the development has been maintained. A landscape buffer with trees is shown on Sheet 2 to provide screening between the new development and the existing homes on Glenmont Drive and Shalbey Trail. A notation has been added to Sheet 1 indicating a maximum density of 3.83 units per acre for residential development. No revisions to the development guidelines have been submitted.

**Staff Review Comments:**

1. Section 1268.05(a) requires a minimum site of ten acres; however, the Planning Commission and City Council may consider areas of less than ten acres if they determine the proposed SPD is necessary to achieve the purposes in Section 1268.01 as follows:
  - (f) To regulate the development and use of property in areas throughout the City that contain sensitive or unique environmental, historic, architectural, or other features which require additional protections and flexibility not provided through the application of the Zoning Code;
  - (g) To promote creative and sensitive site planning;
  - (h) To provide for a greater range or mixture of compatible uses than would be allowable in the standard zoning districts of this Code, while also requiring features that protect against negative impacts of incompatible land uses or harm to the environment;
  - (i) To provide an effective method for the City to guide the development of such areas so as to preserve unique characteristics or to provide for the greater range or mixture of land uses when appropriate; and
  - (j) To create a regulatory structure which will allow more flexible and creative design of the built environment, within the limits of the approved conceptual development plan, than is possible with the lot-by-lot design approach of a conventional zoning district.

2. The Planning Commission, pursuant to Section 1268.01 as stated above, shall determine if the purpose of a Special Planning District has been met, and that one or more of the following conditions listed in Section 1268.05(c) below exist within the proposed SPD:
  1. A concentration of existing or proposed retail, service or industrial establishments serving as a business activity center for the community.
  2. Land that is occupied by substantial natural characteristics worthy of preservation or which are historic aids to the identification of residential communities.
  3. Lands which call for ingenuity and imagination by site designers and developers in keeping with overall land use and open space objectives of the Comprehensive Plan, while departing from the strict application of use, setback, height, lot size and related requirements.
3. Provide the cul-de-sac length of the Glenmont Drive extension in proposed SPD-8; Section 1228.02(d) of the Subdivision Regulations states streets designed to be permanently dead ended shall not be longer than 600 feet, unless a greater length is approved by the Planning Commission, and shall be provided, at the closed end, with a turnaround having an outside pavement diameter of at least 100 feet and a street property line diameter of at least 120 feet.
4. Pursuant to Section 1268.02, the rezoning, conceptual plan and development guidelines are subject to City Council approval, for which a public hearing is required, in accordance with Section 1268.06(b) of the Zoning Code and City Charter Section 6.02.

Revisions to the development guidelines as recommended by the independent consultant:

1. Minimum building envelope widths and depths should be added (insert in Section D). Additionally, Section D(3)(a) states building envelopes shall be located 20' from the SPD-8 boundary; however, the conceptual plan indicates a 15' separation. Consistency should be provided between the development guidelines and conceptual plan.
2. A minimum 200 sq. ft. of private outdoor space, with minimum dimensions of 10', shall be provided (add to Section E) to allow residents flexibility in the manner for which the outdoor spaces are designed and used.
3. In order to accommodate supplementary parked and stopped vehicles, and to allow for a clear path for emergency vehicle access, recommend limiting parking on one side of the street or a designated area, and no parking on the cul-de-sacs (add to Section E).
4. In order to ensure the sides and rear of the paired villas will be attractive, add the language "Structures shall use offsets, projections, recesses and other comparable design elements to avoid long, uninterrupted wall or roof planes, and a variety of textures and materials will be used to add interest and character." (This language is



consistent with development standards in The Preserve at Meadow View SPD-6 and Oak Ridge Preserve SPD-7 and should be added to Section E).

5. In order to prevent garage-prominent dwellings (“snout houses”), add “The garage door shall be a maximum of 2’ forward (toward the primary access street) of either the front wall of the main living area, if there is no covered porch; or the front porch line, provided the porch is both covered with a roof and has a concrete frost depth foundation. In no instance shall the garage door be more than 6’ in front of the main living area.” (This language is used in Section 1284.06(j)(1) for single family cluster development and should be added to Section E(3)(e) of the development guidelines).
6. Concerning landscaping, with a 4’ width between the sidewalk and the street, the independent consultant does not recommend adding street trees, though provisions in the development guidelines should be made to make the street and front yards attractive. He suggests planting trees of a smaller species with careful spacing between the house and sidewalk, along with other landscape elements, which should be added to the development guidelines. Provide additional details around the placement of new trees to maintain the buffers and natural feel of the site, i.e. size, species, locations and numbers (add to Section E).
7. Further details for Sections F, G and H regarding Commercial Uses; Commercial Density, Separation and Floor Area Requirements; and Commercial Development Standards, respectively, shall be provided.

**Staff Recommendations:**

Staff recommends moving the discussion plan to a public hearing on the rezoning, conceptual plan and development guidelines, provided the above items are addressed.