

MINUTES OF MEETING  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
DECEMBER 19, 2018

\*\*\*\*\*

Members Present: Allen, Murphy, Gustafson, DeMarco, Bishop

Presence Noted: Ray Reich, Building Commissioner  
Andrew Bemer, Law Director  
James Moran, City Council President

\*\*\*\*\*

Chairman Bishop called to order the November 20, 2018 meeting of the Planning Commission at 7:00 P.M. in Council Chambers of Rocky River City Hall. He said he would like to recognize that this is Mr. Gustafson's last meeting as a member of the Planning Commission and he thanked him for his service.

Mr. Bishop announced that the first item on the agenda is to approve the minutes of the November 20, 2018 Planning Commission meeting. Mr. DeMarco moved to approve the minutes of the November 20, 2018 Planning Commission meeting, as presented. Mrs. Murphy seconded.

**3 Ayes – 0 Nays – 2 Abstain (Murphy, Gustafson)  
Passed**

**1. TACO BELL – 21805 Center Ridge Rd. – Final Review – Landscaping Plan Incorporating Monument Sign.** Mr. Jim Larsen, Architect, came forward to present the plan.

Mr. Larsen began by explaining that they will enhance the existing landscaping around the monument sign and a new sign base will be constructed of brick to match the existing building. Colors on the building signs were discussed as well as the sign colors, which both have purple in them. There will be no purple color anywhere on the building itself. There will also be mulch applied to the other areas of landscaping on the site,

They dimensions of the monument sign are shown on the plans and Mr. Larsen said that the sign was approved by the Design and Construction Board of Review.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Gustafson moved the grant final approval for the landscaping plan incorporating the monument sign for Taco Bell, 21805 Center Ridge Rd. Mr. DeMarco seconded.

**5 Ayes – 0 Nays  
Approved**

**2. RIVER HILL CONDOMINIUM ASSOC. – 20333 Detroit Rd. – Preliminary/Final Review – Additional Monument Sign.** Mr. Vince Agresta, Contractor, came forward to present the project.

Mr. Agresta explained that the Condominium Association would like a sign in this location so that traffic can more easily identify the location of the building. The existing sign sits far back on the lawn of the Detroit Rd. elevation and is difficult to see. That sign faces Detroit Rd., and this one will face north and south on Northview Rd. There are no plans to replace the sign on Detroit Rd. that Mr. Agresta is aware of.

Mr. Bishop said that he has some suggestions to enable them to have a sign that is much more functional. He said that the location does not comply with the Code regarding setback, the site lines for traffic reasons, and he does not see the benefit of this sign location, because it does not seem to help them that much. He thinks that consideration should be given to moving it to the Detroit Rd. corner, near Northview Rd. There is somewhat of a triangular area there and the sign would comply with the setback while being much more visible to traffic on Detroit and on Northview Rd. He said that the existing sign on the property is in very bad condition and should be eliminated. Mrs. Murphy added that the orientation of the existing sign is odd because it is parallel to Detroit, and what Mr. Bishop suggested seems like a very good solution. Mr. Agresta said that the Association is not opposed to following direction from this Planning Commission. Mr. Bishop said that he is not a fan of unilock material and thinks he would like to see two piers with stone that matches the brick of the building. He said that the Commission needs better information on the setback, and the application needs to be formalized. Mrs. Murphy said that the sight lines are important and cautioned them not to block sight lines of traffic in their next plan.

Mr. Bishop suggested that they experiment using a piece of wood on stakes to determine the best position for the sign so that it is visible from both streets. The site plan should label the setback from the Northview Rd. and Detroit Rd. The minimum setback from the right of way is 10', which would actually be 11' from the sidewalk. He said that the existing sign is in bad shape and should be taken down, and this proposed sign can be the main sign because it is a better location.

Mr. Agresta said that he would like to take these ideas back to his clients and he will return for another preliminary review at a later date. He thanked the planning commission for their time.

Mr. Gustafson moved to table the proposal for an additional monument sign at River Hill Condominium Association, 20333 Detroit Rd. Mrs. Murphy seconded.

5 Ayes – 0 Nays  
TABLED

**3. A GALLERY OF HAIR – A SUITE SALON – 20015 Detroit Rd. – PRE-PRELIMINARY REVIEW – Change of Use to a Beauty Salon in an Existing Building.** Mr. Gary Fischer came forward with Howard McGuire and Wendy Kamm, business and property owners, to present the project.

Mr. Fischer said that since the last pre-preliminary review, they have reduced the number of suites inside the building to 18 suites instead of 24 suites. They have also increased the parking lot by proposing to excavate into the hillside, and they can now provide 24 spaces on site. However, they are still short spaces because their parking requirement is 36 spaces. The business model consists of individual operators who rent the suites, and act as their own individual salon. At the applicants' Avon location, the average occupancy is about 50% of the suites at one time. They are considering offering valet service to accommodate parking during peak times on peak days, where clients can leave their car with a valet at the front door, and the valet will park the cars on the site, sometimes even double parking them. The client would text for their vehicle when they are checking out and their car would be waiting for them at the door. They are also working on the exterior to fine tune the look of the building.

Mr. Bishop said that he appreciates the applicants' effort but they are still very short on parking. Also, there is a 20' setback at the rear, but they are permitted a 15' setback. Mr. Fischer said that that they could probably dig into the hillside a little more, but it may only get them about 2 more spaces. At the setback they show now, the retaining wall will be about 16 or 17' tall.

Mr. Gustafson said that he gets his hair cut at Sola Salon in Westwood Town Center that has a similar layout to this one but it is much larger. He wonders whether only 23 suites is even a profitable size at this location. Ms. Kamm said that they rent to specialty technicians at this location, and the rents would be different than her Avon rents. They ran the numbers at 18 suites and it will work out for them financially.

Mr. Bishop said that the Code does not permit parking against the building when there is openings as shown on their plan. Mr. Fischer said that the openings will be glass block, so the window will not be operable. Mr. Bishop responded that per our Zoning Code, an opening means an opening in the wall, and it does not matter whether it is fixed glass or not. He said that he may have a solution that will help them to gain some parking. He explained that there is a setback requirement of 10' for the parallel parking on the west property line, but he thinks that they can give some leniency on that requirement. If a 5' buffer of landscaping was installed between the parallel parking and the west property line, and the ingress/egress was moved closer to the building, he thinks it would make the site function better. He said that they would then gain a couple of spaces on the east line and allow the opportunity for buffering between the east wall of the adjoining property. Since there is a blank wall adjacent to the west property line he suggests that they add a few parallel parking spaces where it is currently located on the site and then add a few more as they get deeper into the site. Mr. Fischer said that by doing that, the number of parking spaces on the site would increase to 32.

Mr. DeMarco said that as they could load about five head-in parking stalls deeper on the western edge of the site, and pick up parallel parking along the rest of the west property line. Mr. Bishop said that they are obviously trying to lead the applicants into some creative ways of achieving more parking on the site, but their job is not to design the site for them. He encouraged the applicant to think outside of the box with regard to parking design, because at the end of the day, they will lose business if there is no place to park on the site. He also suggested they reduce the 20' rear setback to 15'.

Mrs. Murphy asked if they have explored some sort of off-site parking arrangement for the operators of the suites and the applicant responded that the nearest available parking is about one mile away and that is too far away for customers and for operators to park.

The applicants thanked the Planning Commission for their input.

**7. TOMORROW'S SALON – 20160 Center Ridge Rd. – PRE-PRELIMINARY REVIEW – Change of Use to a Beauty Salon on the First Floor of an Existing Building and Exterior Renovation.** Mr. John Swidrak of AODK Architects, came forward with Anci Brennan and Rezso Molnar, Business and Property Owners, to present the project.

Mr. Swidrak explained the existing conditions of the parking areas, which currently includes eight existing non-conforming parking spaces in the front as well as separate drives for entering and exiting the rear of the site. The pavement of the parking in the rear is shared with the neighboring building and there are 32 existing spaces on the rear of this property. There are currently no handicap spaces on site. They are proposing to remove the non-conforming parking spaces along Center Ridge Road and to create a minimal landscape buffer between the sidewalk and the building, with patio space for guests and salon clients in front. He explained all of the existing business uses in the building and said that Tomorrow's Salon plans to occupy the entire first floor of the building. There is a small tenant space that will remain in the northeast corner of the building.

Mr. Swidrak explained that they are proposing 30 parking spaces in the rear, with 2 handicap spaces. He described the changes that they will be making to the exterior of the building, and discussed them while referring to the proposed renderings that are before the Planning Commission. They will paint the brick building a warm grey color, add an eyebrow canopy against the upper windows, and a sun-blocking canopy on the lower windows to shield the salon chairs from sun shining through the windows. He discussed the landscaping in the front, which includes box planters that are built into the patio space, and masonry walls with decorative block accents. The aesthetic theme of the exterior embraces a mid-century south Florida style.

Exterior signage plans were presented, as well as discussion on how they will be making all three floors of the building accessible from the back parking lot. The interior will have an elevator that currently does not exist. He explained the existing and proposed floor plans so the Planning Commission could understand where the existing tenant spaces are located, the current use, square footage, office hours and number of employees on all three floors. Based on the square footage and use, they are proposing that the basement will need 5 parking spaces. The first floor is approximately 6600 sq. ft., consisting of 12 stylist chairs and some personal service areas. The first floor will require 29 spaces, and the existing first floor Airko office in the northeast corner requires 2 parking spaces. The second floor currently houses Giant Eagle office employees and OCI, and has 4400 sq. ft. of administrative office space, and 15 parking spaces are needed for that floor.

Mr. Swidrak summarized that the building requires 51 spaces and they currently have 30 spaces shown in the back parking lot. They also have a preliminary agreement with the land owner across the street at Rockport Shopping area, who is willing to provide 10 to 15 spaces. With those spaces included, they will have a total of 45 spaces available to them.

Mr. Bishop said that this project has the potential to be a fantastic redevelopment of that property but it has a gigantic parking problem. He said that the Code does not call out services such as a manicures, massages and facials, but he feels that those services are no different than a hair stylist and would have the same parking requirement. Using that theory, they need somewhere between 78 and 80 required parking spaces. Law Director Bemer said that he agrees with Mr. Bishop's analysis of the parking requirements for the other personal services. The applicant responded that there is a cross agreement with the property to the west for parking. Mr. Bishop said that the according to the parking requirements the building next door only requires 20 spaces, and it looks like they have 10 extra spaces in the parking lot that are available to share. Mr. Molnar said that there is a verbal agreement in place now, which has been in place for 30 or 40 years. Mr. Swidrak said that stylists do not share spaces with other stylists, so the chairs are not all in use at the same time because there are part time stylists working here. He added that the other personal services are not booked throughout the entire day either. This model works differently than a personal service establishment that has stylists who are there non-stop every day.

Mrs. Murphy commented that the site lends itself to reciprocal parking across the street and next door. Ms. Brennan explained that they serve 80 clients per day on average, and the maximum time a client is there is 2 hours. She said that with the part time stylists and manicurists, if they only work 20 hours per week, then their chairs and stations are left empty the rest of the week because she does not allow her stylists to share spaces. There is overlap with a couple of the private spaces shown on the plans, which would only be used by the specialty stylists for certain services when they are not working on the main floor, and those rooms would not be used simultaneously. Ms. Brennan said that this location will house the same hair stylists and personal service providers that they

currently have and they will not be adding any more. There will be a maximum of 15 employees at any one time and their hours of operation are from 9:00 a.m. to 8:30 p.m. She added that no employees work that entire time span. Their busiest times are from 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. and from 5:00 p.m. to closing. They do nearly 50% of their business after 5:00 p.m. when other offices in the building are closed.

Mr. DeMarco suggested that they stripe across the property line that separates the two properties so that they could gain approximately 6 more spaces. If they re-striped the entire back parking lot, across both properties, they could get more spaces than that. Mr. Molnar said that he has a meeting with the adjacent property owner and he will discuss this with them.

Mr. Bishop said that they a parking requirement of 78 to 80 spaces and they should discuss what a reasonable deviation to the Code, based on this specific business and the other uses in the building, would be acceptable. The Planning Commission agreed that they would be comfortable with approximately 65 parking spaces being provided on the site. The Planning Commission agreed that they should try to get 15 parking spaces across the street, where the employees would park. Mr. Bishop said that there are side and rear yard setbacks required for the dumpster with leniency being able to be provided depending on the quality of the buffering.

Mr. DeMarco concluded that he thinks that the patio in the front will make a statement on Center Ridge Road and his hope is that this project will be the catalyst to inspire other property owners to redevelop properties along Center Ridge Road.

The applicant was advised to develop a plan to redesign the rear parking area for this property and the property next door, which demonstrates how much onsite parking they can achieve. This will allow the applicants to determine exactly how many parking spaces they will need to lease across the street. Law Director Bemer encouraged the applicants to secure a parking agreement, at least on letterhead for the time being, to present to the Planning Commission when they come back for the preliminary review of the project.

The applicants thanked the Planning Commission for their input.

**5. ORDINANCE 87-17 – Specifically RRCO Section 1153.07(2)(b) – MANDATORY REFERRAL – Conclusion of Planning Commission Review.**

Law Director Bemer explained that City Council asked for a clarification of what was meant by the Planning Commission when they tabled the rear setback requirement for lakefront properties in August. This is basically a move to clean up the record after the fact because City Council removed this specific section from the Ordinance at their most recent meeting. The Mayor is part of the Cuyahoga County Planning Commission and is

in discussion with them regarding having them look at the difficult proposition of lakefront development.

Mr. Bishop said he recalls that they tabled it because they could not agree on the language of the section. There was a discussion about the difference between the diagonal line points and the average setback, and that was why it was tabled. The effort was to redraft language that was more precise as to how the points would be determined. Law Director Bemer said that if the Planning Commission would like to indicate to City Council that this should be put back on the agenda, then they can certainly do so.

Council President Moran came forward and said that the Ordinance had too many things attached to it at the same time, which caused frustration for City Council. It was decided that certain issues, such as side yard fences and this particular lakefront setback issue should be introduced separately. They are looking for Planning Commission to make a specific recommendation regarding how they should look at the setback issue. Law Director Bemer suggested that the Planning Commission recommend to City Council that the setback calculations in the R-1 and R-2 district, and in light of the Lake Road project with R-3 and R-4 development, be looked at separately in the future.

Mr. Gustafson moved to make no modification to lakefront setbacks at this time, and the Planning Commission recommends that the rear yard setbacks for R-1 and R-2 along the lakefront be reviewed at some time in the future. Mrs. Murphy seconded.

5 Ayes – 0 Nays  
Passed

The meeting adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
William Bishop, Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael DeMarco, Member

Date: \_\_\_\_\_