

Planning Commission
Regular meeting
Minutes
November 12, 2009
Page 2

allowed a hard surface parking area but allow gravel for the aisles and access aisles. The plan is to put parking in the rear for the employees. Parking will not be available for the public. The existing hard surface entrance driveway extends from Lost Nation Rd. up to the existing building.

Mr. Lanhan said that the existing shed on a concrete pad will be razed. Concrete will be added to the pad to allow more parking.

Mr. Lanhan said that the lot is fenced in except an area on the south side of the property. Mr. Smith said that 10' high fencing is required for outside storage.

Chairman Irvine advised Mr. Lanhan that he could waive the hard surface for the entire parcel which includes parking and access drives and aisles. Jim Sayles advised Planning Commission that by waiving hard surface for the entire property will increase storm water run-off. Gravel is more pervious than asphalt and concrete but less pervious than grass. If Planning Commission doesn't think the applicant needs the hard surface pavement it will be a good idea to waive that also. Richard Smith said that when a site plan is submitted to the Building Department the run off will be looked at then.

Mr. Lanhan said that there is a catch basin in the gravel parking lot.

Mr. Lanhan said that the addition will have three bays in response to Rick Hart's question.

The materials consist of 10' high block, then split face block and then metal siding. The color consists of different shades of tan for each type of material. The colors and material will match the existing building. Bob Fiala requested that Mr. Lanhan submit samples of the material and colors to Jim Sayles or Richard Smith. He will not have to return to Planning Commission for approval.

Chairman Irvine advised the members that if Planning Commission approved the revised site plan it will be for waiving the requirement for hard surface parking.

A motion was made by Bob Fiala and seconded by Jerry Merhar to approve the site plan and elevations plan with the following:

Planning Commission
Regular meeting
Minutes
November 12, 2009
Page 4

"**Congregate Living Facility**" which is listed in Section I was deleted from our code.

There are two "**Home for Handicap Persons**" facilities listed in Section I which are "**Family**" and "**Group**". Richard Smith explained the difference between the two. The difference between these two facilities are: In the "**Family**" facility, the provider lives on the premises. In the "**Group**" facility, the provider does not live on the premises.

Mike Lucas said that there are four items in our code that have definitions which are listed in Section I of the memorandum which are: "**Adult Day Care Facility**"; "**Home For Handicapped Persons, Family**"; "**Home For Handicapped Persons, Group**" and "**Nursing Home**".

We do not have a "**Home For Children**" facility in Willoughby and this item will be deleted.

Jerry Merhar stated that "**Senior Citizen Development**" which is listed in Section II has multiple definitions. Richard Smith said that "**Senior Citizen Development**" is found in the C.O. 1155.04 and C.O. 1155.07(hh) code. It had to be defined so they could get funding. Chairman Irvine stated that funding shouldn't dictate what we have.

Rick Hart said there are five undefined items. We should see the effect on our previous category to see if they deserve their own definition or if they should be incorporated in the already defined items.

Chairman Irvine suggested that we accept the five items that are already defined and to recognize that we have undefined items.

Chairman Irvine stated that by not counting "**Senior Citizen Development**" there's only four categories that are undefined which are: "**Homes for Children**" which isn't needed so that leaves "**Homes for the Aged**" which falls in the category of "**Assisted Living Facility**" and "**Nursing Home**". "**Long-term Care Facility**" is the same.

Chairman Irvine said that there is only one term for Mike Lucas to look at and that is "**Senior Citizen Development**".

DISCUSSION

THE CHAGRIN RIVER WALK
(John Spear)

P.P.#27B-37A-6
P.P.#27B-37A-7
Mentor Ave.

**Discuss. - devel.,
rezoning, Asstd Lvg
& lot split
D-B dist.**

Chip Marous and John Spear of Vintage of Vintage Development Group represented this discussion of a proposed mixed use development. Mr. Marous said that 17.25 acres of 22.5 acres will be developed composed of three components which will be separate projects. The **west** portion of the property will consist of an **apartment complex** consisting of 180 units on **13.75 acres**. The 4.30 acre **middle** section consists of a four-story building consisting of **33,000 sq. ft. retail** use on the first floor and **60,000 sq. ft. office** use on the top three floors. Two **1-story out buildings** consisting of 11,000 sq. ft. total will occupy the front of the middle parcel. The **east** parcel consisting of **3.30 acres** consists of **72,000 sq. ft.** with a combination of a 1-story brick building in the front and a 3-story brick building in the rear for 83 units for **assisted living use**.

The apartment buildings consist of red brick on the lower portion and beige siding on the upper portion. The area where the garages are located will have landscaping for screening. The 1 and 2 bedroom apartments will contain 700 to 1,100 sq. ft. area. Mr. Marous said they will own the apartment complex in response to Chairman Irvine's question.

Mr. Marous said the project will be done in three phases. Phase I is the assisted living facility. Phase two is the apartment complex. Phase III is the office/retail complex. Mr. Marous is asking for Planning Commission conceptual approval this evening. He said he will come back individually three times to get approval for each phase.

Richard Smith said that this is a schematic development plan approval. It is the concept of the entire development. Richard Smith said that a separate development plan will be submitted for each component.

Mike Lucas said that this item is on the agenda for discussion and Planning Commission cannot take action on this plan.

Planning Commission
Regular meeting
Minutes
November 12, 2009
Page 7

Bob Fiala said that the apartment complex which is on a critical site sets on the River and looks like a barracks. Mr. Fiala said that Jerry Ranally, Councilman of this ward where the property is located, could not be present this evening and he is very interested in the project. Mr. Fiala said he would not feel comfortable taking action without Mr. Ranally's input.

Chairman Irvine said that he was confused on the term "Schematic Plan" approval. Mr. Smith said that this approval is under C.O. 1109.04(g)(3). Chairman Irvine said the last time this project was before the Commission the approval covered the entire property. If looked at in pieces we don't have an agreement in terms of what was approved. Then anything can be done.

Mr. Fiala said that he wants a development plan approval that shows everything.

Chairman Irvine said that he prefers to reach an agreement on an overall plan so Planning Commission can say that "we approved" this overall plan so they can't deviate from that.

Mr. Merhar said that there has to be a discussion between Bob Fiala and Jerry Ranally. If they are comfortable with that plan then they will come to the next meeting and give their approval on a general plan. At the same time the first phase with a lot split will be submitted for the assisted living proposal.

Mr. Smith said that C.O. 1109.04(b)1 to 3 is the formal tool to use for approval in response to Chairman Irvine's question.

Mr. Merhar stated that there's no vehicle for an overall conceptual approval.

Bob Fiala said that an overall plan was approved the last time in response to Janice Lipscomb.

Chairman Irvine said the last approval wasn't split up. He wants to be consistent with what was done last time. The development plan should carry a lot more detail than what is being presented this evening. Mr. Marous said he will get detail for each phase.

Richard Smith said that if a lot split is being done for each item then why not do a development plan for each one.

Planning Commission
Regular meeting
Minutes
November 12, 2009
Page 8

Chairman Irvine said that he wants to ensure that besides being in agreement with the development as a concept that there also is teeth in the agreement. If the project is done lot by lot then each becomes a separate distinct project which can change over time. If the property is sold then we have nothing in place. If we have an approved development plan we can hold it up as a banner for any subsequent owner.

Mike Lucas said that there will be a text change at the next meeting for C.O. 1109.04(b) to change "Building and Zoning Inspector" text to "Planning Commission" text.

Chip Marous said that the approval will be a master plan and at the same time a separate approval for assisted living and for Ingress Egress.

Chairman Irvine requested that the Secretary look up the file on what was approved two years ago. Also the Secretary is to have Mike Lucas advise her on how to list the proposal on both the Ingress Egress and Planning Commission agenda for the submittal. Mr. Lucas said that if this is going to be a development plan than the criteria is that of a development plan.

Chairman Irvine said that the decision was reached as to what submittals are for the next meeting which are an overall development plan, a lot split and a development plan for the assisted living phase I project.

No action was taken on this discussion which was on the agenda for discussion only.

There being no further business the regular meeting closed at 9:40 p.m.

Robert Irvine, Chairman

Betty A. Nardelli, Secretary