

CITY OF HUDSON
PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING OF OCTOBER 10, 2011
7:30 P.M., TOWN HALL

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

The Chair, Mrs. Barone, called to order the Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Hudson at 7:30 p.m. in Town Hall, 27 East Main Street, Hudson, Ohio.

ROLL CALL

Present: Mr. Cox, Mr. Drew, Mr. Kagler, Mr. Mulligan, Mrs. Barone
Absent: Mr. O'Keefe

Officials Present: Thomas E. King, Director, Mark Richardson, City Planner, Aimee W. Lane, Assistant City Solicitor

John S. Vittum, landscape consultant to the City, was present.

Minutes were taken by Ms. La Lomia, Planning Commission clerk.

OATH OF TRUTHFULNESS

Mrs. Barone, the Chair, placed everyone under oath who would be giving any testimony during the meeting.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

CASE NO. 2011-32, SITE PLAN REVIEW, FIFTH THIRD BANK, 5074 DARROW ROAD

Mr. Richardson stated this was a site plan review for a 4,400 square foot bank at the corner of Darrow Road and Norton Road which was a by-right use in this district. He reviewed the staff report.

Gerald Weber, architect, 13711 Madison Avenue, Lakewood, represented Fifth Third Bank. He explained the site was at the northwest corner of Darrow and Norton Road, the abandoned DoublePlay facility. He said the applicant would subdivide two acres from a larger portion that the owner owned. He said it would have two access points. He explained there was an existing bank branch on West Streetsboro Street and this would be a hub office which had more variety of offices. He said there would be a drive-through in the bank. He addressed the parking and explained there would be 7 to 10 employees so 11 spaces would be just enough for employees and that they normally set the parking spaces at 42 spaces. He said they had taken out a number of spaces at

the request of the staff and because of the added right-of-way granted to the City. He said they were requesting 33 spaces.

Mrs. Barone asked whether they had seen all of the conditions. Mr. Weber replied, yes.

Mr. Cox asked how they decided the number of parking spaces. Mr. Richardson said to landbank any amount of spaces it should be more than only one or two. He said the applicant said 24 spaces were the bottom number needed.

Mr. Cox asked whether granting the City the right-of-way was part of the problem. Mr. Richardson said the parking issue was separate from the right-of-way issue.

Mr. Kagler asked about the driveway on Norton Road and the access easement. Mr. Richardson said the access easement extended to include that Norton Road driveway. He said the City asked for an access easement during the lot split process but no specific location for the driveway was contemplated. He said the Darrow Road access point worked out well.

Mr. Kagler asked whether in the long term when the land around it was developed the driveway for the bank would serve the surrounding retail development. Mr. Richardson said there would be a major access point 400 feet to the west. Mr. Kagler said a secondary access point for all of the retail could move to the west. Mr. King said the whole plat was not included in this project and there was a larger access road to this area which was meant to be the main lot and would border that land. This could be viewed as a secondary. They will have legal right to use this access driveway.

Mr. Kagler asked whether the neighboring property owner would have the right to use this driveway. Mr. King replied the plat would be amended. There was discussion regarding the existing easement, additional right-of-way dedications, building setbacks from the proposed right-of-way, and sidewalks. Mr. Weber showed on the map the easement and right-of-way areas.

Mr. Kagler questioned the condition regarding sidewalks. Mr. Richardson thought the new sidewalks would be five (5) feet in the original right-of-way line and not be relocated at this time. Mr. Kagler thought the existing sidewalk on Norton Road was four (4) or five (5) feet. Mr. King expected that sidewalk would have to be replaced and moved with reconstruction of Norton Road due to the interchange.

Mr. Kagler inquired about condition 3 regarding the ingress and egress lanes having some sort of barrier. Mr. Richardson said it would be off the new right-of-way line and would be worked out by engineering.

Mr. Kagler asked whether there was a site plan showing the sidewalk moved with condition 4. Mr. Richardson did not think it had been moved on the revised plan. He thought it could be all of the new right-of-way line.

Mr. Kagler asked which were the suggested landbank parking spaces. Mr. Richardson proposed the northern six spaces. Mr. Kagler agreed with the recommendation to have as little parking as possible.

Mr. Kagler asked whether the lighting fixtures were required to be setback. Mr. Richardson replied no, they were not.

Mr. Drew asked whether there was a sidewalk on the Route 91 side. Mr. Richardson replied, no, but there would be one with this project. Mr. Drew asked whether the existing sidewalk would be moved in conjunction with extending the sidewalk, and Mr. Richardson replied, yes.

Mr. Drew suggested having the driveway be strictly only ingress. Mr. King said it would tend to cause a problem to the property to the north. Mr. Drew asked whether the traffic study considered that. Mr. King said the traffic study was done on behalf of the Fifth Third Bank and the City Engineer felt it was appropriate, safe and adequate.

Mr. Drew said it seemed like a lot of parking, mostly in the front. He thought landbanking was a good concept with fewer parking appearing at the Darrow Road side.

Mr. Mulligan asked the status of meeting the recommendations in Mr. Vittum's letter. Mr. Richardson said the landscape plan had been revised but had not yet been reviewed. Mr. Mulligan asked whether it changed the upper contour of the driveway or the drive-through. Mr. Weber replied the landscaping was going to hide the majority of the parking area and the driveways. Mr. Mulligan asked whether there would be any mounding. Mr. Weber said they had a lot of fill in this area and there was some grading so it would end up naturally being higher. He said if some mounding was desired they could do so.

Mr. Mulligan asked why there were so many drive-through lanes if the bank wanted people to come in. Mr. Weber replied this bank would be more than just checking and saving accounts.

Mr. Mulligan commented this may not always be a Fifth Third Bank and thought the site had more impervious surface than necessary. Mr. Weber said they had less than they were allowed by Code.

Mr. Mulligan said the site had a lot of mature trees. Mr. Weber said they were attempting to save a number of trees.

Mr. Mulligan asked about the Architectural and Historic Board of Review approval. Mr. Richardson said the applicant appeared informally at the last meeting for the building but had not designed the sign yet. He said they met the height requirements for the lighting and would not change the number of poles.

Mrs. Barone asked whether storm water issues still had to be resolved. Mr. Weber replied there would be a detention basin. Mrs. Barone asked about the water quality. Mr. Weber replied the EPA would have to reinvestigate.

Mrs. Barone opened the public hearing, there being no comments, she closed the public hearing.

Mr. Cox thought the project should be approved as recommended. He said the overall DoublePlay site has been vacant for a few years and this would be a nice improvement. He said Fifth Third Bank knew what they were doing with regard to how many employees they want for a hub bank.

Mr. Kagler inquired about the driveway on the north side of the building being one way. Mr. Richardson said two way was required. Mr. Weber said the fire department required a fire lane and they asked for it to be 20 feet. Mr. King said fire also needed vertical clearance and if fire recommended 20 feet he was comfortable with their recommendation.

There was further discussion regarding adding new sidewalks now, width of existing sidewalks, landbanking parking spaces, when proposed road changes would occur, trees being taken down, permeable pavers, and the applicant providing additional right-of-way at no cost to the City.

Mr. Kagler moved to approve the Site Plan for Case No. 2011-32 for a bank with five drive-up aisles to be located at 5074 Darrow Road at the intersection of Darrow Road and Norton Road according to plans dated as received October 4, 2010 provided the following conditions are met.

1. The sidewalk on Norton Road must be reconstructed at the proposed right-of-way line and extended to the west property line.
2. Landscape consultant John Vittum's comments of September 23 and City Arborist Tom Munn's comments summarized in the Community Development Department letter of September 16, 2011 must be addressed to the satisfaction of the CD office. A bond in the amount of 110% of the cost to install the landscaping must be submitted.
3. The in and out traffic lanes at the Darrow Road access point must be separated by an island to prevent north-bound left turns acceptable to the City Engineer.
4. The new sidewalk on Darrow Road must be moved to the new right-of-way line ten feet west of the existing right-of-way line.
5. The existing shared access easement along the west property line must be extended east to include the Norton Road access drive.
6. The Map of Lot Split and Consolidation recorded December 4, 2008 and the Declaration of Easements recorded January 5, 2009 must be revised to address changes to the Darrow Road and Norton Road rights-of-way and the shared access easement at the southwest corner of the site.
7. The City Engineer must approve the plans including review of the proposed extent of the detention basin with consideration to reducing the extent of grading so as to retain some or all of the existing pine trees at the west side of the proposed basin.
8. Six or seven of the parking spaces must be land-banked. Installing the land-banked parking would require no further approvals except staff approval and the issuance of a separate zoning certificate. The Commission suggests the applicant consider the use of pervious pavers for spaces closest to Darrow Road.

9. Exterior lighting poles and fixtures must be revised if staff finds they do not meet LDC requirements.
10. The monument sign setback must be measured from the proposed right-of-way lines.
11. Satisfaction of the above conditions prior to the scheduling of a preconstruction meeting with City officials and no clearing, grading or construction of any kind shall commence prior to the issuance of a Zoning Certificate.
12. Before scheduling a preconstruction meeting, the applicant shall install silt fencing and/or polypropylene fencing to mark and protect approved clearing limits, which shall be maintained by the applicant.

Mr. Drew seconded the motion.

Mr. Kagler suggested changes to condition #1 regarding sidewalks. There was further discussion regarding waiting to put in new sidewalk or doing it now.

Roll Call:

Aye: Mr. Cox, Mr. Drew, Mr. Kagler, Mr. Mulligan, Mrs. Barone

Nay: None

Motion carried.

CASE NO. 2011-33, MODEL HOME, 6578 CHESTWICK LANE

Mr. Richardson reviewed the staff report for a model home by Prestige Homes in the Estates at Canterbury subdivision.

John Russell, Prestige Homes, 17 West Streetsboro Street, Hudson, explained they had a model home approved two years ago for a different house in the subdivision. He said when that house sold they moved into another home for less than a year and now were asking for a model home to be located at this address.

Mrs. Barone said typically a model home has parking. Mr. Russell said there was a circular drive in the front and some parking on the street but mostly would be pulled off the street.

Mrs. Barone opened the public hearing, there being no comments, she closed the public hearing.

Mr. Mulligan moved to approve the application for Conditional Use approval for Case No. 2011-33 for a model home at 6578 Chestwick Lane in the Estates at Canterbury Subdivision. This conditional use will expire October 10, 2013. The applicant must comply with the model home conditions contained in Section 1206.02(c)(18)(A-E) of the Land Development Code. Mr. Cox seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

Aye: Mr. Cox, Mr. Drew, Mr. Kagler, Mr. Mulligan, Mrs. Barone

Nay: None

Motion carried.

CASE NO. 2011-34, SITE PLAN REVIEW, 44 CLINTON STREET

Mr. Richardson reviewed the staff report. He said the applicant agreed to extend the sidewalk to Morse Road.

Joe Matava, Peninsula Architects, 1775 Main Street, Peninsula, represented Carriage Group. He explained this was a minor addition to the existing structure, moving the entrance down to the southwest and tying into existing storm drains. He said they would extend the sidewalk west along Clinton Street to Morse Road and add a tree.

Mrs. Barone asked whether he had read the conditions. Mr. Matava replied, yes, he had no objections.

Mr. Drew asked what was the height. Mr. Matava replied it was a story and a half plus a walkout, 23 feet to the ridge from the parking lot.

Mr. Kagler questioned the location of the sidewalk with the curb. Mr. Matava said they were preserving 12" and 9" maple trees.

Mr. Kagler asked whether five (5) feet width sidewalk was consistent with the east. Mr. Richardson replied, yes.

Mr. Kagler questioned condition 1 about easements. Mr. Richardson explained the corner of the sidewalk crossed private property and the purpose of the easement was to allow public access across the corners. Mr. Kagler asked if it was public sidewalk on private property, and Mr. Richardson replied, yes. Mr. Kagler asked whether this property owner could obtain any greater benefit for use of their site by working with the City in the future on parking. Mr. King said there was public parking and across was privately owned. He said it would have to be studied since at some point there will have to be other First and Main parking.

Mr. Mulligan asked the timeframe of the project. Mr. Matava replied they would like to start on it this year.

Mr. Mulligan said this was a well-kept property and asked about signage at the entrance. Mr. Matava replied there was not going to be any additional signage. He said if it is, it would be on the door.

Mrs. Barone opened the public hearing, there being no comments, she closed the public hearing.

Mr. Kagler questioned whether there needed to be ADA accessibility. Mr. King said there did not have to be ADA accessibility. Mr. Richardson said there would have to be some kind of ramp where it was higher.

Mr. Mulligan moved to approve the Site Plan for Case No. 2011-34 for an addition to Carriage Insurance located at 44 Clinton Street according to plans received October 3, 2011 provided the following conditions are met.

1. An easement or other means acceptable to the City must be executed to make

2. The comments of Construction Inspector Ed Ratchford listed in his letter of September 23, 2011 must be addressed.
3. The underground electrical line at the southeast corner of the building must be located and painted before any excavation.
4. No clearing, grading or construction of any kind shall commence prior to the issuance of a Zoning Certificate.
5. Before a zoning certificate may be issued the applicant shall install silt fencing, polypropylene fencing, and/or other means acceptable to the City to mark and protect approved clearing limits, which shall be maintained by the applicant.

Mr. Kagler seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

Aye: Mr. Cox, Mr. Drew, Mr. Kagler, Mr. Mulligan, Mrs. Barone

Nay: None

Motion carried.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Kagler moved to approve the minutes of the September 12, 2011 Regular Meeting, as amended. Mr. Mulligan seconded the motion.

Roll Call:

Aye: Mr. Cox, Mr. Drew, Mr. Kagler, Mr. Mulligan, Mrs. Barone

Nay: None

Motion carried.

The Chair, Mrs. Barone, adjourned the meeting at 8:55 p.m.

Jennifer Barone, Chair

Nora La Lomia, PC Clerk