



PLANNING DEPARTMENT

27700 Hilliard Blvd.
Westlake, OH 44145

Phone 440.871.3300
Fax 440.617.4324

**WESTLAKE PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
APRIL 6, 2015**

Present: Chairman Dan Meehan, Mark Getsay, Phil DiCarlo, Scott Fatzinger
Absent: Brad Lamb
Also Present: Planning Director Jim Bedell, Assistant Planning Director Will Krause,
Law Director John Wheeler, Clerk of Commissions Nicolette Sackman

Discussion of agenda items and fact finding was conducted at 7:00 p.m. The regular meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m. by Chairman Dan Meehan.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Fatzinger moved, seconded by Mr. Getsay to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of March 2, 2015.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Fatzinger, Meehan, Getsay, DiCarlo

Nays: None, motion passed

COUNCIL REPORT

Councilman Getsay reported on council items.

SELECTED CORRESPONDENCE

3/26/15 email from Attorney Don Powers requesting Ordinance 2012-115 and Crocker Woods be tabled

3/19/15 letter from Bennett Builders requesting Ordinance 2012-115 and Crocker Woods be tabled

3/19/15 letter from Councilman Getsay notifying residents Ordinance 2012-115 and Crocker Woods would be tabled

4/02/15 email from Steve Hammerschmidt re: AJ's Urban Grille

3/31/15 email from Tom Roach, 4463 Mallard Circle re: The Goddard School

4/6/15 letter from Justin Orley requesting to table Community Greek Orthodox Lot Split & Assembly and the Fox Run Subdivision Preliminary Plan to May 11, 2015

4/2/15 letter from Salim Kherani, 2307 Beaver Creek re: Fox Run Subdivision Preliminary Plan

OLD BUSINESS

Ordinance 2012-115 Rezone land near Center Ridge and on Crocker, PP#217 27 001 & 217 25 002 from R-1F-80 (Single Family) to Planned Unit Development, Ward 6, ref. by council 9/20/12, tabled 11/12/12, 12/3/12, 1/7/13, 1/7/13, 2/13/13, 6/3/13, 9/9/13, 10/7/13, 12/2/13, 4/7/14, 8/4/14, 10/6/14, 11/10/14, 1/12/15; 3/2/15; 3/2/15 requested extension of time to expire 5/31/2015 – applicant requests to be tabled

Motion: Mr. Fatzinger moved and Mr. Getsay second to request an extension of time for Ordinance 2012-115 until September 14, 2015

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Fatzinger, Meehan, Getsay, DiCarlo

Nays: None, motion passed

Motion: Mr. Fatzinger moved and Mr. Getsay second to table Ordinance 2012-115

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Fatzinger, Meehan, Getsay, DiCarlo

Nays: None, motion passed

Crocker Woods Cluster Preliminary Development Plan for cluster single family, PP#217 27 001 & 217 25 002, for two single family lots and 60 single family cluster homes in PUD zoning, south of Center Ridge Road and west & east of Crocker Road (the area previously known as Bretton Woods Park Subdivision Phase 4), Ward 6, tabled 12/3/12, 1/7/13, 2/13/13, 6/3/13, 9/9/13, 10/7/13, 12/2/13, 4/7/14, 10/6/14, 11/10/14, 1/12/15, 3/2/15 – applicant requests to be tabled

Motion: Mr. Fatzinger moved and Mr. Getsay second to table the Crocker Woods Cluster Preliminary Development Plan

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Fatzinger, Meehan, Getsay, DiCarlo

Nays: None, motion passed

NEW BUSINESS

Crocker Park Sign Criteria and Master Sign Plan, revisions, within Crocker Park, rep. B Meng, Ward 5

Mr. Levitz explained the criteria has been revised to correct the site plan in Section 1.2; correct the typo in Section 11.2 from 100,000 sq. ft. to 80,000 sq. ft.; and revise some of the large format advertising (LFA) signs. In Section 13.4 LFA #34 is smaller than before. For LFAs #35 and #36 he has prepared renderings as Mr. Krause had concerns that they would be visible from Crocker Road. LFA #38 has additional language added that it will not be installed until the A parking garage is built.

Mr. Krause reviewed his staff memo noting the changes in the site plan for the locations of the LFAs due to the configuration changes of the buildings in the K Block. He did go out to the site to take photos of existing conditions to show where signs will be located and where they will be primarily visible. LFAs #35 and #36 are taller signs which may be visible from Crocker Road, as would #38 but they have agreed to add language to the criteria for LFA #38, similar to what is already in the criteria for LFA #37, that #38 will not be installed until the A parking garage is constructed.

Discussion ensued by the commission that the intent of the original sign criteria was for a lot of the sign types that are not permitted elsewhere in the city to only be internal to Crocker Park and not be visible outside of Crocker Park. Over time the criteria has been revised but there were concerns with some of the proposed LFAs being visible from Crocker Road. Once the A parking garage is built will it really screen LFA #38 or will additional screening be necessary or for the sign to be repositioned elsewhere. There were concerns that LFAs #35 and #36 were too tall and would be seen from Crocker Road. Mr. Levitz did have revised renderings of signs # 35 and #36 showing them shorter and not placed as high up on the building. The commission preferred the shorter lower placed locations for LFA #35 and #36. They discussed what would be primarily visible and how to revise the plans. The commission would like to see LFA #38 further revised and brought back at the next meeting.

Findings of Fact:

Proposed revised changes as per 2/23/15 transmittal from applicant:

1. Section 1.2 – overall key plan, pedestrian alley between KSE-I and KSE-II added.
2. Section 11.2 – typo correction, heading says 100,000 sq. ft. but this was approved to apply to office and hospitality tenants of 80,000 sq. ft. or greater as shown in heading on upper table on the same page.
3. Section 13.4 – Block K LFAs – Location 34 – has been updated with the new building KSE-II footprint and added text indicating architectural screening shall be required behind signs 1 and 2 subject to the approval of Planning Commission.
4. Section 13.4 – Block K LFAs – Location 35 – has been added due to the new pedestrian alley and the revised garage stair tower location.
5. Section 13.4 – Block K LFAs – Location 36 – has been revised due to the new pedestrian alley and the revised garage stair tower location.
6. Section 13.5 – Block K LFAs – Location 38 – has been updated with the new Building KSE-II building footprint and added text indicating architectural screening shall be required behind the sign and subject to the approval of Planning Commission.

Motion: Based upon the above findings-of-fact Mr. Fatzinger moved and Mr. Getsay second to approve the Crocker Park Sign Criteria and Master Sign Plan revisions (Section 1.2 – overall key plan, pedestrian alley between KSE-I and KSE-II added; Section 11.2 – typo correction to 80,000 sq. ft. or greater as shown in heading on upper table on the same page; Section 13.4 – Block K LFAs Location 34 has been updated with the new building KSE-II footprint and added text indicating architectural screening shall be required behind signs 1 and 2 subject to the approval

of Planning Commission) and LFA #35 and #36 with the following recommendations:

1. That LFA #35 and #36 be lowered as presented in the second presentation and that the final height be administratively approved.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Fatzinger, Meehan, Getsay, DiCarlo

Nays: None, motion passed

Motion: Mr. Fatzinger moved and Mr. Getsay second to table LFA #38 until the May 11th meeting.

Vote: 4 ayes, 0 nays, motion carried

The Limited, Storefront and Sign Plan, 211 Crocker Park Blvd., PP#211-25-004, rep. R. Levitz, Ward 5

Mr. Levitz explained this is a new tenant that will be using a portion of the old storefront and making minor revisions to the storefront. The signs will be revised and Mr. Levitz reviewed the proposal. Mr. Krause reviewed his staff memo and advised the proposal complied with the criteria.

Storefront Findings of Fact:

1. The minor changes to the storefront match the existing storefront.

Motion: Based upon the above findings-of-fact Mr. Fatzinger moved and Mr. Getsay second to recommend approval of The Limited storefront.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Fatzinger, Meehan, Getsay, DiCarlo

Nays: None, motion passed

Sign Plan Findings of Fact:

1. The proposal complies with the sign criteria.

Motion: Based upon the above findings-of-fact Mr. Fatzinger moved and Mr. Getsay second to approve The Limited sign plan

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Fatzinger, Meehan, Getsay, DiCarlo

Nays: None, motion passed

Landmark Luggage Storefront & Sign Plan, 256 Crocker Park Blvd., PP#211-25-004, rep. R. Levitz, Ward 5

Mr. Levitz explained this is a new tenant that will be using a portion of the old storefront and making minor revisions to the storefront. The signs will be revised and Mr. Levitz reviewed the proposal. Mr. Krause reviewed his staff memo and advised the proposal complied with the criteria and were of a nice design. He suggested a condition that the red door and awing are considered part of the storefront and not the sign plan.

Storefront Findings of Fact:

1. The changes to the storefront match or supplement the existing storefront.

Motion: Based upon the above findings-of-fact Mr. Fatzinger moved and Mr. Getsay second to recommend approval of Landmark Luggage storefront with the following:

1. Condition that the red awning and door are considered part of the storefront, not part of the sign area.
2. All departmental comments from Section III of the staff report are addressed

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Fatzinger, Meehan, Getsay, DiCarlo

Nays: None, motion passed

Sign Plan Findings of Fact:

1. The proposal complies with the sign criteria.

Motion: Based upon the above findings-of-fact Mr. Fatzinger moved and Mr. Getsay second to approve Landmark Luggage sign plan.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Fatzinger, Meehan, Getsay, DiCarlo

Nays: None, motion passed

Community Greek Orthodox Lot Split & Assembly, end of Fox Run (east of Beaver Creek), PP#214-29-018 & 215-25-010, rep. C. Szucs, Ward 1 – applicant requests to be tabled

Motion: Mr. Fatzinger moved and Mr. Getsay second to table Community Greek Orthodox Lot Split & Assembly until May 11, 2015

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Fatzinger, Meehan, Getsay, DiCarlo

Nays: None, motion passed

Fox Run Subdivision Preliminary Plan, end of Fox Run (east of Beaver Creek), 17 lots, PP#214-29-018, rep. C. Szucs, Ward 1 – applicant requests to be tabled

Motion: Mr. Fatzinger moved and Mr. Getsay second to table Fox Run Subdivision Preliminary Plan until May 11, 2015

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Fatzinger, Meehan, Getsay, DiCarlo

Nays: None, motion passed

The Goddard School Development Plan (addition), 30502 Center Ridge, PP#217-07-010 & 011, rep. R. Parsons, Ward 6

Mr. Parsons explained the proposal is to add an addition to the building for two classrooms, a staff break room, party room, raised platform for performances, office area, gymnasium with a basketball and volleyball courts and additional mechanical and auxiliary space, 16 parking spaces, a dumpster enclosure and landscaping/buffering. Mr. Bedell reviewed his staff memo noting the addition is 7,500 sq. ft. Last year a lot assembly was approved by the



commission but the applicant listed multiple parcels on the application so if has not been recorded it should be before construction. The plans show EFIS being used and Mr. Bedell would prefer to see brick but if EFIS is used it should all be the same color (tan). The applicant stated that light poles would not be taller than the existing 16' tall poles.

Mr. Ed Lefko, 4422 Teal Ct. was present and raised concerns with drainage; past water damage he has had on his property and to his home; the slope of the property directs water to his yard; asked for more details about the retention basin; questioned if the swale at the rear of the yard would be filled; suggested a tree lined mound; and initially there were bright lights and he did not want to see his yard illuminated by the lighting. Mr. Parson reviewed the drainage and retention basin proposal. He can take a look at what lights are existing but they are not part of the addition, but will look into any concerns.

Findings of Fact:

1. The existing dumpster is being converted to a storage building and will remain in the same location that it is currently in.
2. No modifications are required for this use.
3. A sample of the EFIS is needed for staff approval, if one is not provided at the meeting.
4. The retention basin is understood to be a dry basin that will only hold water during storm events. If it is not a dry basin, additional fencing is required.
5. The light poles are understood to be not more than 16' tall.
6. The applicant must complete the lot assembly process prior to construction.

Motion: Based upon the above findings-of-fact Mr. Fatzinger moved and Mr. Getsay second to recommend approval of The Goddard School Development Plan with the following:

1. Comments received in Part III of the staff report are addressed.
2. Condition that the EFIS portion of the material be a solid light tan color and to be submitted for administrative approval.
3. Condition an earthen mounding to be added under the row of Colorado blue spruce trees, the scope of which will also be administratively approved.
4. The approval is subject to approval of the final plans by the Building and Engineering Departments in compliance with the code and the ordinances of the City of Westlake; and, in the development process, should there be any changes necessitated by engineering requirements that visually alter the appearance of the development approved by the Planning Commission, the plan shall be re-submitted to the Planning Commission.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Fatzinger, Meehan, Getsay, DiCarlo

Nays: None, motion passed

AJ's Urban Grille Development Plans (outdoor dining), 25939 Detroit Rd., PP#213-21-001 & 213-18-006, rep. S. Hammerschmidt, Ward 1

Mr. Liggett, architect, explained the proposal is for an outdoor dining patio that is expanded into the parking lot. The area will be reconfigured to add the patio, fencing, sidewalk, bollards and lighting. The east island area will be a painted island with stripes and they will

be adding painted arrows to the parking lot to direct patrons. Keeping this island just striped will help with snow plowing and traffic flow.



Mr. Bedell reviewed his staff memo noting the striped island would be better as a landscaped island to match the island to the west. Snow does cover stripes and arrows painted on the parking lot and having a raised island was preferred to better direct traffic. He noted that the engineering department would like to see the sidewalk curbed and requires paving details.

Members of the commission reviewed the proposal noting that they also preferred the proposed striped island to be a landscaped island to match the existing island to the west. Discussion ensued on noise/music, service area, access points, fence height and lighting. Mr. Liggett noted there will be ambient noise/music but no plans for anything that would be loud. The servers will have a separate entrance from the front door entrance and the bar and beverage station will be inside not outside. The fence will be 4' tall with bollard an additional 4" taller.

Findings of Fact:

1. The applicant has designed the patio with safety features, as requested by the Police Department.
2. More detail is needed for the Engineering Department.
3. The Engineering Department has recommended against the angular curbing sidewalk in favor of a radial one.
4. The striped island should be a landscaped island to better facilitate the flow of traffic and to provide symmetry with the existing island to the west.
5. A landscape plan is required.

Motion: Based upon the above findings-of-fact Mr. Fatzinger moved and Mr. Getsay second to recommend approval of AJ's Urban Grille Development Plans with the following conditions:

1. Conditions in Part III of the report shall be addressed.
2. Revised plans addressing the items in Part III of the report and in the Findings of Fact shall be provided for administrative approval.
3. Condition that the striped island be a landscape island to match the original landscaped island (opposite the drive).
4. The approval is subject to approval of the final plans by the Building and Engineering Departments in compliance with the code and the ordinances of the City of Westlake; and, in the development process, should there be any changes necessitated by engineering requirements that visually alter the appearance of the development approved by the Planning Commission, the plan shall be re-submitted to the Planning Commission.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Fatzinger, Meehan, Getsay, DiCarlo

Nays: None, motion passed

Atrium Building Development Plan (driveway addition), 30396-30400 Detroit Rd., PP#211-18-029, rep. J. Ousley, Ward RD 5

Mr. Jeremy Ousley (architect) and Mr. Joe Wang (co-owner) were present. Mr. Ousley explained the proposal is to add a driveway entrance on Cedarwood. They have safety concerns with existing traffic exiting left onto Detroit Road across multiple lanes of traffic and potential for accidents. They would like to be able to turn right out onto Cedarwood so traffic can make a left turn at the traffic light.

Mr. Bedell reviewed his staff memo advising an exit onto Cedarwood is a lot safer than the current conditions for a vehicle needing to travel eastbound on Detroit Road. He suggested adding a channeling island in the drive so it would only allow right turns out onto Cedarwood and right turns in from Cedarwood. A channeling island would deter traffic from turning left onto Cedarwood.

Members of the commission discussed the proposal and agreed routing traffic onto Cedarwood to turn left on Detroit Road was a good alternative to the existing conditions. It was noted that channeling islands often do not work as some people will go in the out or out the in. Mr. Wang noted they would like individuals to be able to enter the drive from Cedarwood by turning either right or left but was amendable to what the commission suggested. An island does create plowing issues but they are most concerned with safety issues for vehicles exiting eastbound onto Detroit Road from the existing driveway. Discussion ensued to recommend approval with the driveway being redesigned per the engineering department's specifications as they may have other requirements that planning is unaware of.

Findings of Fact:

1. The proposal met the intent of section 1221.11 and 1221.15.
2. The driveway has the potential of reducing potential vehicular turning conflict points for drivers exiting eastbound onto Detroit Road.

Motion: Based upon the above findings-of-fact Mr. Fatzinger moved and Mr. Getsay second to recommend approval of the Atrium Building Development Plan with the following conditions:

1. The new driveway be redesigned for right turns in and right turns out (onto Cedarwood) per engineering department's specifications for the new driveway on Cedarwood.
2. The approval is subject to approval of the final plans by the Building and Engineering Departments in compliance with the code and the ordinances of the City of Westlake; and, in the development process, should there be any changes necessitated by engineering requirements that visually alter the appearance of the development approved by the Planning Commission, the plan shall be re-submitted to the Planning Commission.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Fatzinger, Meehan, Getsay, DiCarlo

Nays: None, motion passed

Autonation Ford (Revision to approved development plan & reimaging), 23775 Center Ridge Rd., PP#214-11-003, rep. CJI Inc., Ward 1

Mr. Peter Newfield, YSM Design, and Mr. John Auble, CJI Inc., were present. Mr. Newfield explained they are rebranding the dealership to current Ford designs for dealerships. Changes will be made to the interior and exterior of the building. Part of the rebranding has a Ford entry element and fascia system added in the front of the existing showroom building that will require a modification as it will sit in the setback. Mr. Newfield reviewed the color and material samples.

Mr. Krause reviewed his staff memo noting most of the work being done is interior items that do not require planning commission approval. As noted the design fascia will sit into the front setback. A part of the existing building is painted block and the rebranding and painting of the existing brick and block building will modernize it and bring all the various sections of the building to have a similar design and color pallet. The signs will be revised and overall they reduce the amount of sign area on the property.

Findings of Fact:

1. Most of the renovations are inside the buildings and do not require Planning Commission approval.
2. The new freestanding Ford entry element and fascia system added in the front of the existing showroom building is constructed of a grey colored aluminum composite material.
3. The applicant stated that they had a survey done and Sheet A051 notes that the existing building is 64' 7 3/16" from the planned ROW, the entranceway element protrudes 5' 2 3/16" and the rest of the new fascia protrudes approximately 1.5' into the required 60' setback.
4. Other exterior changes include covering a portion of the front building with corrugated metal panels.
5. The proposal includes re-painting a portion of the existing masonry on the front showroom building and newly painting the rear blonde colored brick service building to match the new color scheme.
6. Section 1237.04(c)(3)B.4. considers "painted block" an inappropriate exterior material.

Motion: Based upon the above findings-of-fact Mr. Fatzinger moved and Mr. Getsay second to recommend approval of the Autonation Ford minor revision to development plan with the following modifications and conditions:

1. A 5.5' front setback modification for the entranceway element and a 1.5' front setback modification for the rest of the new fascia.
2. Modification to allow painted brick and block as an exterior building material.
3. Condition that applicant complies with requirements spelled out in department reviews listed in Part III of the staff report.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Fatzinger, Meehan, Getsay, DiCarlo

Nays: None, motion passed

Findings-of-fact – sign plan:

1. They are eliminating two approximately 120 sf non-illuminated wall signs from the existing showroom building.

2. They are adding one 21 sf and one 31 sf internally illuminated logo to the front of the showroom building.
3. They are replacing internally illuminated sign letters on the showroom and service buildings with new internally illuminated letters of the same size (39”), color, and height.
4. There will be a net reduction of approximately 188 sf of sign area on the property.

Motion: Based upon the above findings-of-fact Mr. Fatzinger moved and Mr. Getsay second to approve the Autonation Ford Recommend sign plan with a condition that the new letters are the same 39” height, color and size as the existing letters.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Fatzinger, Meehan, Getsay, DiCarlo

Nays: None, motion passed

The Fountain Café & Grille Sign Plan, 27828 Center Ridge Rd., PP#216-33-003 & 031, rep. R. Sallouha, Ward 4

Mr. Sallouha explained he purchased the building for his restaurant. There were old existing signs on the building that were rusted and in need of replacement. Currently there is a projecting blade sign on the building and there was a tall pole sign. He removed the panels of the wall sign but left the existing frame for now. The pole sign was falling apart so he cut it down but would like to reuse the existing poles but at a shorter height. Putting a monument sign on the ground will block visibility for traffic so he would like the sign to be mounted higher than a ground sign.

Mr. Krause reviewed his staff memo noting the use of the building as a restaurant is a legal non-conforming use as the building has been there before the city became a city. He reviewed the proposal which is for two wall signs on the building, with the removal of the existing projecting blade sign frame, and a new post and panel sign. The overall area of signage is being reduced.

Findings of Fact:

1. The Fountain Café & Grille is a legal non-conforming use in a multi-family district.
2. The owner removed the sign frame of a non-conforming pole sign.
3. The owner is proposing to remove the sign frame of an existing 56 sf projecting sign on the building.
4. The current code only entitles the property 24 sf of sign area, based on the 24’ wide front wall of the building. Planning Commission has the discretion by code to allow additional sign area for a corner building.
5. The building and parking are on separate parcels but if combined together they make the “business premises” a corner parcel.
6. The current proposal is for a 28 sf freestanding sign and two wall signs totaling 43.34 sf.
7. The three signs will provide business identification on the front (south), east, and west sides of the “business premises”.

8. The current proposal is a reduction of at least 14.66 sf of sign area over what was previously displayed on the “business premises”.
9. The freestanding sign as proposed falls within the size and height currently permitted for a freestanding sign for a business in a commercial zoning district.
10. The freestanding sign as proposed is within the planned right-of-way.
11. The proposed freestanding sign is internally illuminated and replaces a non-conforming pole sign that once appeared to be internally illuminated.
12. Internally illuminated signs are not permitted in residential districts but Planning Commission has the discretion to permit externally illuminated ones.

Motion: Based upon the above findings-of-fact Mr. Fatzinger moved and Mr. Getsay second to approve The Fountain Café & Grille Sign Plan with the following conditions and modifications:

1. Condition that the owner remove the existing 56 sf projecting sign frame on the building.
2. Modification to count a second side of the building toward sign area as a corner business.
3. Condition that the freestanding sign be moved at the owner’s expense if Center Ridge Road is widened.
4. Condition that the new freestanding sign have a dark background and be externally illuminated in such a way as to not cast glare into the eyes of drivers or pedestrians or create a nuisance for nearby residential properties.
5. Condition that the lighting specifications for the externally illuminated freestanding sign are submitted to the planning department for administrative approval.
6. Condition that any outline lighting of the windows only be illuminated as a seasonal decoration and comply with Sections 1223.07(d), 1223.11(i), and 1223.12(d) of the Westlake Sign Code.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Fatzinger, Meehan, Getsay, DiCarlo

Nays: None, motion passed

**The Park Subdivision Sign Plan, Park Ave. &
Bradley Rd., PP#217-04-057, rep. N. Milstein, Ward
6**

Ms. Mary Anne Serafino, Easy Sign, reviewed the proposal which is for a subdivision entrance sign. Mr. Krause reviewed his staff memo, noting the design is nice and the sign will not be illuminated. The sign is a post and panel sign with stone piers.

Findings of Fact:

1. The proposed sign complies with code except that by the definition in the code it is not a monument sign because 50% of the sign face does not go to the ground.
2. The sign is not currently planned to be illuminated.

Motion: Based upon the above findings-of-fact Mr. Fatzinger moved and Mr. Getsay second to approve the Park Subdivision Sign Plan with the following modification and condition:

1. Modification to permit the proposed freestanding post and panel sign with cultured stone piers.
2. Condition that the sign is not illuminated without Planning Commission approval.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Fatzinger, Meehan, Getsay, DiCarlo

Nays: None, motion passed

**State Farm Insurance Sign Plan, 27070 Detroit Rd.,
PP#213-03-032, rep. J. Frezel, Ward 3**

Mr. Joel Frezel explained the proposal is for a new wall sign and new window graphics. The new sign will be smaller than the existing sign and the window graphics will be replaced with new graphics. Mr. Krause reviewed his staff memo and photos taken of the existing site. The proposal will fit in better with the other existing signs in the plaza, which does not have a master sign criteria. The overall amount of signage is being reduced.

Findings of Fact:

1. The existing sign area is being reduced by approximately 14 sf.
2. The property currently has no freestanding signage.

Motion: Based upon the above findings-of-fact Mr. Fatzinger moved and Mr. Getsay second to approve the State Farm Insurance Sign Plan with a modification to allow 11.77 sf of excess sign area for this tenant space.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Fatzinger, Meehan, Getsay, DiCarlo

Nays: None, motion passed

**Suggested Code Amendment 1221.05 Schedule of
Parking Requirements regarding Residential
Parking**

Mr. Bedell reviewed his staff memo. He noted that the engineering department would like regulations for driveways/parking areas in residential areas. He recognized that further calculation of the numbers provided in the suggested code amendment may be required. There are a variety of size and shape lots in the city so it is difficult to determine a dimension for driveway width and parking area as there are so many variables.

As drafted (partial draft – chart only):

Dimensions for Parking in Required Front Yard

Lot Frontage	Maximum Width of Parking Area Including Driveway	Maximum Area of Improved Parking Surface Including Driveway*
100 feet or less	24 feet	1,200 sq. ft.
101 feet or more	36 feet, or 30% of lot width, whichever is less.	1,800 sq. ft.

* The Planning Commission may approve additional square footage for longer driveways if necessitated by the location of the garage on the property or other circumstances deemed appropriate.

Members of the commission discussed the draft and agreed that further study and revision was needed. The text portion of the draft was good but no one was certain what figures should be used for dimensions as there are U shaped driveways, lots with very long depth, wide lots, large lots, small lots, and a variety of multi car garages within the city. It was suggested that maybe addressing a required amount of green space might be better. No one wants to see a yard that is entirely paved but it was uncertain what amount should be allowed to be paved and how much should be green space or how to regulate the amount of drive/parking in a residential district.

Motion: Mr. Fatzinger moved and Mr. Getsay second to table the suggested code amendments to 1221.05 Schedule of Parking Requirements for further discussion.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Fatzinger, Meehan, Getsay, DiCarlo

Nays: None, motion passed

MISCELLANEOUS - None

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 9:25 p.m. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Monday, May 11, 2015 in the Westlake City Hall Council Chambers.

Chairman Dan Meehan

Nicolette Sackman, MMC
Clerk of Commissions

Approved: May 11, 2015