

June 3, 2021

Lyndhurst, Ohio
June 3, 2021

The Planning Commission of The City of Lyndhurst met in Special Session on Thursday, June 3, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. via the permitted Zoom platform.

Members Present: P. A. Ward, Chair
D. Sirk, B. Herberth
Councilman LoPresti, J. Marino

Others Present: J. Luskin, Director of Law
R. Schmidlin, Assistant Law Director
J. Maichle, Building Commissioner
D. Bader, Architectural Board of Review
N. Nozik, Architectural Board of Review
E. Schwab, Architectural Board of Review

5378 Mayfield Road

Continue review of development plan, material samples, parking, and landscape details for proposed addition.

Mr. Ben Gingrich, HSB Architects, representing Carter Properties, presented a revised site plan and stated the front parking area has been reworked to show ingress and egress through the existing center lane. He further stated there are some issues with getting the parking closer to the building, due to the grading.

Mr. Mickey Petrous, HSB Architects, stated that if the parking area is closer to the building, the windows would have to be redesigned. He further stated the further away the parking is, the easier it would be to grade.

In answer to Mr. Sirk's question, Mr. Gingrich stated that is correct, that some parking spaces have been removed on the eastern edge of the parking lot to allow for the ingress drive and for regrading the lot.

Mayor Ward stated as the plans show now, the closer the parking gets to the building, the more abrupt the grading change becomes and the less opportunity you have to move water away from the building. He also cautioned against making the parking lot lanes too narrow.

In answer to Mr. Sirk's question, Mr. Gingrich stated that the front parking area will be reviewed again with the civil engineer.

Mr. Sirk stated that one of the concerns he has is pulling the parking lot closer to the building so that the curb cut onto Commodore Road would not be at a plus ninety (90) degree turn.

June 3, 2021

Mr. Marino suggested adding five (5) feet to the turn onto Commodore Road, and stated he is not overly concerned regarding the placement of the parking close to the building, but if it can be reworked, it would be beneficial.

Regarding the truck access in the rear of the building, Mr. Gingrich stated that a larger loading zone will be created, the landscaped island will be eliminated and the abandoned AAA drive through window will be removed as well. He then stated that the number of dumpster sites will be consolidated into one large area with a privacy fence. He further stated that the entire proposed west addition will not be built, as the proposed elevations show.

Mr. Petrous presented some proposed color and materials samples. He stated that the brick, Yukon Blend, is the closest brick to match the existing.

Ms. Nozik suggested that if the brick cannot be matched perfectly, it may be better to compliment the existing brick.

Mr. Bader stated that the proposed landscaping along Commodore Road will help soften the aesthetics of the different brick and to screen the dumpster area at the southeast corner. He then suggested using a portion of the building as a retaining wall be restudied. He also stated that the parking count is incorrect and less than required.

In answer to Ms. Nozik's question, Mr. Gingrich stated that after the civil plans are complete, then landscape plans will be submitted for approval.

Mr. Sirk explained that permission was given to allow for less parking, with the understanding if the shopping center and the side streets were to become impacted by allowing less parking on the site, the owner would then agree to revise the landscaping in the rear parking area. Mr. Sirk further commented on the grading – stating that it is a missed opportunity to solve the grading issues by letting the grade come to the building, and slope away from the building instead of creating a dip.

In answer to Mr. Sirk's question regarding parking spaces, Mr. Gingrich stated that six (6) more spaces were added to the front parking area from the original proposal.

A lengthy discussion continued about the front parking area.

Regarding the required wall and landscape which acts as a buffer at the rear of the commercial property, Mayor Ward explained that deviation from the required wall was an agreement between the residential neighbors and the owner of the commercial property, which the Commission allowed.

On behalf of the Architectural Board of Review, it was moved by Ms. Nozik, seconded by Mr. Bader to approve the proposed plans for the building addition footprint, massing and exterior materials to be used.

The question was put to a voice vote and passed unanimously.

Motion carried.

Mr. Sirk cited Section 1174.02 of the Zoning Code, which states “. . . that no enlargements or expansion of such non-conforming building or use shall be made.” It was explained that this existing building is non-conforming due to its square footage on the property.

Mayor Ward reminded the Commission that additional land was acquired, which does help to move the building towards conformity, and to help with traffic flow.

Mr. Schmidlin explained that Section 1174.01 gives discretion to go beyond the strict requirements of the code, and to make recommendations to council.

Mr. Sirk stated that he feels that with the addition and the improvements to the parking lot, the owner of the building is moving closer to conformity than non-conformity. He stated that in light of Section 1174.02, the owner of the property has shown, in his proposed renovation that he is moving towards conformity: he has purchased additional land, included a curb cut onto the side street, which would alleviate traffic on to Mayfield Road. He then stated that it would be beneficial if these points can be coupled with moving towards conformity of the forty (40) foot buffer. He then stated that although it is impractical to achieve the forty (40) foot buffer, the applicant has made every effort through skillful architectural site planning and engineering to move towards conformity. Relative to the size of the building, the Commission recommends to council to support the new business, the max gross area limitation of twenty thousand (20,000) square feet, which is non-conforming, be allowed to continue with the expansion. As individual buildings, they are approximately nine thousand (9,000) square feet from twenty thousand (20,000) square feet. This site is uniquely large as a continuous property. He further stated that a recommendation should also be made that while the parking is currently not compliant to current code, every effort has been made to increase the most desirable parking at the front of the building through the efforts of the developer and the architect, the Commission encourages variance from the parking demand based on the fact that the most necessary parking at the front is being improved and added to versus the overall parking count.

Mayor Ward stated that it should be noted that the applicant will be returning to the Commission for the final parking plan, and to the Architectural Board for the final landscape plan.

Mr. Sirk suggested cleaning up the existing landscaping in the rear parking lot, fixing and repositioning the existing dumpsters and adding an additional dumpster location on the eastern side of the property for easier truck access to empty the dumpsters. He then strongly suggested that the rear parking lot be restriped.

Mayor Ward stated it would be beneficial to see both proposed plans for the rear parking lot; one plan showing removal of the existing odd shaped landscaped island. He further stated there is a discrepancy on the number of parking spaces for the site, and suggested land banking for this purpose.

June 3, 2021

Mr. John Carter, Owner, stated it is his intent to restripe both the front and rear parking lots when most of the work is completed.

Mr. Gingrich stated that the angled parking immediately behind the smaller building will most likely be aligning those and extending it all the way to the larger building, which will add five (5) parking spaces close to the building, although these parking spaces would be in the rear, they are close to the walk-through archway of the building.

Mr. Sirk recommended that in Phase I of the parking reconfiguration, the maximum number of parking spaces directly adjacent to the walk-through archway be included. He further recommended that the center island in the rear parking lot be maintained and landscaped. He further stated that if the building owner is willing to land bank for parking spaces, the Commission will accept a lower parking space minimum.

In answer to Mr. Sirk's question regarding the western portion of the building, Mr. Carter stated that handicap parking spaces will be added. Mr. Sirk stated that the proposed plans for the western portion of the building are not accurate and recommended that the western portion of the existing building remain as is, which includes the parking.

Mr. Sirk recommended that the entire façade of the building have a continuous band, a pre-cast stone, which would help the addition connect to the existing building.

It was moved by Mr. Sirk, seconded by Mr. Marino that recommendation be made to Council for a preliminary approval recognizing the non-conformity but recognizing also the acquisition of the additional land is moving toward conformity, and that the owner be given permission to begin foundation construction and recognizing that the Architectural Board of Review has approved the aesthetics of the building and the materials as presented, and that every effort be made to increase the front landscape setback and the owner of the building will return to the Commission for a final recommendation on the parking, and that every effort be made to reconfigure the parking at the building's rear lot, the section that is against the building to create more parking whether it be removing curb or striping and also recognizing that the site is uniquely large when compared to the traditional sites along the Mayfield Road Corridor. In addition, the Planning Commission is encouraged by the reconfiguration of the loading dock and the introduction of additional trash enclosures, which the Commission finds that it is an improvement and moving towards conformity.

Roll Call: Yeas: Sirk, Herberth, Ward, LoPresti, Marino
Nays: None

Motion carried.

It was moved by Councilman LoPresti, seconded by Mr. Sirk that the meeting be adjourned.

The question was put to a voice vote and passed unanimously.

June 3, 2021

Motion carried, meeting
adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

Chair

Approved: _____

Attest: _____