

**KENT PLANNING COMMISSION
BUSINESS MEETING
MARCH 3, 2020**

MEMBERS PRESENT:

**Amanda Edwards
Peter Paino
Michael Bruder
Chris Clevenger-Morris (arrived at 7:17)
Jeff Clapper**

STAFF PRESENT:

**Bridget Susel, Community Development Director
Jennifer Barone, Development Engineer**

I. Call to Order

Ms. Edwards called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

II. Roll Call:

Ms. Edwards, Mr. Paino, Mr. Bruder, Mr. Clapper, and Mr. Morris 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 1109 of the Zoning Code. Anyone interested in appealing a decision of the Planning Commission is advised to seek private legal counsel.

IV. Administration of Oath

Ms. Susel 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. Ms. Susel 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."

V. Correspondence

None

VI. Old Business

None

VII. New Business

- A. PC20-004 Montrose Mazda Kent
1127 W. Main St.
Conditional Zoning Certificate and Site Plan Review & Approval**

The applicants are seeking Conditional Zoning Certificate and Site Plan Review and Approval to renovate and expand the Mazda Store. The subject property is zoned IC-R: Intensive Commercial-Residential Zoning District.

Ms. Barone presented the staff report as provided to the Commissioners. This project will come back to Planning Commission for sign approval at a later date after staff evaluation.

Dan Barney, Arkinetics Architects, 3723 Pearl Rd, Cleveland clarified that the existing structure is 19,000 square feet and the proposed modifications would increase it to 22,000 square feet. Mr. Barney stated that they are pulling the building back from the right of way to meet the setback requirements. He stated that they are installing a landscape buffer, which will mimic Klaben's low shrubs. Mr. Barney concluded that lighting is an issue and they want to light the vehicles along the street.

Public Comment

None

Board Discussion

Mr. Paino stated that he is glad that there is a landscape buffer but feels that the landscape plan is low on quantities. Mr. Paino explained that he feels that the landscaping should create a streetscape and trees are a part of that plan; the plan only show 3-4 trees. Mr. Paino stated that he would like to see a tree-lined street.

Mr. Barney asked how many trees Mr. Paino would like to see.

Mr. Paino stated that he wasn't sure but felt that six trees along the front of the building would be too many.

Ms. Susel clarified that the goal of the landscape plan is to incorporate landscape into commercial areas and not necessarily to create a tree-lined street.

Mr. Barney stated that the landscape plan was intentionally designed low to allow for the presentation of the vehicles. Mr. Barney explained that with tall trees comes tree sap and bird droppings on cars.

Mr. Bruder stated that he feels that there are trees that could be done that would not have canopies that extend over the vehicles. Mr. Bruder stated that he agrees with Mr. Paino and suggested that wherever the word 'lawn' is shown on the landscape plan, they could plant a tree.

Mr. Paino stated that he appreciates the landscaping but would like to see a few more trees; ones that would not drop sap on the cars.

Deric Thomas, 210 Hawks Nest, Aurora, dealership partner, asked if it would be more suitable to have the trees in front of the dealership.

Mr. Paino stated that he is concerned that the size of the proposed landscaping is too small.

Jeremy Eisenberg, 234 Crescent Ridge, Seven Hills, dealership partner, stated that Mazda mandates that the dealership keep one of each model of car upfront for the consumers see in the New Car Display Area parking spaces. Mr. Eisenberg stated that 6 trees will cover the entire area with trees, which doesn't work for retail purposes.

Mr. Bruder stated that he disagrees that the trees will block the entire area as it will take 15 years to develop a 6" trunk on the trees and because the cars on the street are in motion the display area will be visible. Mr. Bruder stated that he feels that more landscaping is beneficial for attracting business and property values. Mr. Bruder stated that the 2 trees on the ends are closer to the cars than the trees that he has suggested would be.

Mr. Clapper stated that he agrees with the applicant and low landscape in the front from a business perspective. He stated that the code does call for 6 trees.

Mr. Paino stated that adding Mr. Bruder's suggested trees to the existing trees on the plan gives a total of 5.

Ms. Edwards stated that she was thinking of taller grasses but now feels that the trees would be better.

Mr. Morris stated that while he appreciates the landscape from a business sense, he feels that they need to protect the entrance to the city and abide by the code; He agrees with Mr. Paino and Mr. Bruder.

The applicant questioned the required location of the landscaping. The Commissioners and the applicant discussed the placement.

Ms. Susel stated that the code states that the trees can be located anywhere on the site.

Mr. Barney suggested allowing the landscaper to decide where the trees would best fit. He agreed that there is a lot of opportunity for more trees.

Mr. Paino agreed that that is a good idea.

Mr. Bruder expressed his concern for the tree location.

Mr. Barney stated that they will try to get the trees up front, they would just like to consult with the landscaper.

Mr. Bruder stated that this is a fantastic project and investment and he would appreciate their commitment to the items discussed.

The applicants stated that they will work with the suggestions but it has to make sense for everyone.

Mr. Clapper questioned the lighting plan.

Ms. Barone stated that there were several locations that spilled over the property line and if they cannot adjust during technical plans review, they will need to go to the Board of Zoning Appeals for a variance.

Ms. Edwards questioned the dumpster enclosure materials.

Mr. Barney stated that it is a masonry enclosure with possibly a vinyl fence front.

Ms. Edwards questioned the bike rack requirement per code.

Ms. Barone responded that the requirement for retail is 1 for every 2,500 square feet, which would mean 1 bike rack for 2 bikes for this project.

Ms. Edwards questioned the drive locations with respect to the neighboring drives.

Ms. Barone stated that the only requirement for a driveway is a minimum of 50 feet to an intersection; no requirements to neighboring driveways.

MOTION: *Mr. Morris moved that in Case PC20-004, the Planning Commission approve the Conditional Zoning Certificate and Site Plan approval to renovate and expand the Mazda Store, 1127 West Main Street subject to the following:*

- 1. Technical Plan Review*
- 2. Adjust the parking lot lights so that the light does not spill over the property lines.*
- 3. Install one (1) bicycle rack*
- 4. Plant a minimum of six trees on the property*

The motion was seconded by Mr. Paino.

The motion carried 5-0.

VII. Minutes

February 4, 2020

February 18, 2020

MOTION: *Mr. Paino moved to approve the February 4, 2020 minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Clapper.*

The motion carried 3-0-2.

MOTION: *Mr. Morris moved to approve the February 18, 2020 minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Paino.*

The motion carried 4-0-1.

IX. Other Business

None

X. Adjournment

MOTION: *Mr. Morris moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Mr. Paino. The motion carried 5-0. The meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.*