

**KENT PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR BUSINESS MEETING  
September 18, 2007**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**     **John Gargan  
Bill Anderson  
Dave Wise  
Sean Kaine**

**EXCUSED:**                 **Matt VanNote**

**STAFF PRESENT:**         **Gary Locke, Plans Administrator  
Eric Fink, Asst. Law Director  
Jennifer Barone, Development Engineer  
Sheila Uzl, Transcriptionist**

**I.     Call To Order**

Vice Chair John Gargan called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Mr. Gargan told the applicants when there was not a full Commission, they did have the choice to postpone their case until there was a full Commission. Three positive votes are needed for a petition to pass.

**II.    Roll Call:**

Mr. Anderson, Mr. Kaine, Mr. Wise and Mr. Gargan were present.

**III.   Reading of the Preamble**

The Planning Commission operates in accordance with the provisions of the Kent City Charter, the Kent Zoning Code and Subdivision Regulations, all of which establish the powers and duties of the Commission. Members of the Planning commission are appointed by Kent City Council and serve without compensation. Certain cases such as Conditional Zoning Certificates, Special Zoning Permits, Overlay District Projects and Zoning Amendment require Public Hearings before the Planning Commission. During the Public Hearing, any person wishing to address their concerns to the Commission will be provided the opportunity. Once the Public Hearing is closed, it shall be the discretion of the Chair whether to allow any additional public comment. Cases such as Site Plan Reviews and Subdivision Projects do not require a Public Hearing. However, the Chair will allow public comment on each case as it is taken on the agenda. In each instance where the Commission receives public comments or conducts a Public Hearing, those persons wishing to address their concerns to the Commission will be required to do so under oath or positive affirmation. The oath or affirmation shall

be administered to all who wish to speak at the beginning of the Planning Commission Meeting. Once a decision has been made by the Planning Commission on a case, the Case is closed for the Commission, as there is no provision to reopen a case. With the exception of cases falling under the Subdivision Code, any decision of the Planning Commission may be appealed to the City's Board of Zoning Appeals in accordance with the Chapter 1115 of the Zoning Code. Anyone interested in appealing a decision of the Planning Commission is advised to seek private legal counsel.

**IV. Correspondence**

None

**V. Administration of Oath**

Mr. Fink instructed those members of the audience wishing to be heard on any of the cases presented at this meeting to rise and raise their right hand. Mr. Fink administered the Oath, "Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony that you are about to give this evening is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? Please say "I do." The participants responded, "I do."

**VI. Meeting Minutes**

**Motion: Mr. Anderson moved that the Planning Commission approve the amended Regular Meeting Minutes of August 7, 2007  
Mr. Kaine seconded the motion. The motion passed 4 – 0**

**VII. Old Business**

None

**VIII. New Business**

- A. PC07-019 Portage County Commissioners  
121 West College Street  
Site Plan Review**

**The applicant is seeking Site Plan Review and Approval in order to permit the construction of additional parking on the property in place of the building that was demolished. The subject property is zoned C-D: Commercial Downtown Zoning District.**

Mr. Gargan asked the applicant to present his request.

Mark Ferguson, 2433 Manchester Road – Akron, Ohio – stated that his company, Four Points is the architect for the project. His company was hired to construct a parking area on the area of the recently demolished building. They have submitted a plan twice to the Community Department and have made the adjustments suggested by the staff. The staff raised concerns in regards to spacing and aisle width. He said there would be 39 additional parking spaces. They will use the existing grading. The site was previously covered with either parking or a building so it was impervious. There are no specific storm water requirements to be satisfied.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

John Plough, 447 Madison Street – Ravenna, Ohio stated he was currently a judge in the Portage County Court System. He said the added parking spaces were needed but not as many as the applicant is proposing. He said that generally speaking the only time extra spaces are needed is for the jurors several times a month. He said during the day, after 10:30 am or 11:00 am, not as many spaces are needed. He would like to see some landscaping installed around the parking area. He said several of the parking spaces could be sacrificed for some nice shade trees and landscaping. He would like to see something other than just pavement.

#### **PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION/ACTION**

Mr. Locke stated that if the Planning Commission felt it was appropriate that the applicant returns with an adjusted site plan that would include a landscaping plan, they could do so. He said the applicant has done an efficient job in planning for the parking without losing much space. He said the other issue was the storm water drainage and that was addressed. He suggested that the Planning Commission have the applicant go back and submit another plan that would include some sort of landscaping.

Mr. Kaine suggested that a variety of plants be included in the landscaping plan that would include trees and shrubbery as well.

Mr. Anderson stated he has no problem with the plan but if the other commissioners wanted to have a landscaping plan included, he would support their suggestion.

Mr. Wise stated he agreed with the need for landscaping in and around the parking lot.

There were no other comments. Mr. Gargan asked for a motion to table this case.

**MOTION: Mr. Kaine moved that in Case PC07-019, Portage County Commissioners that the Planning Commission table this case until the October 16, 2007 Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Anderson seconded the motion. The motion passed 4 – 0.**

IX. **Old Business**  
None

IX. **Adjournment**

**MOTION: Mr. Wise moved to adjourn. Mr. Kaine seconded the motion. The motion passed 4 – 0.**

The meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.