

**KENT PLANNING COMMISSION
BUSINESS MEETING
MARCH 1, 2016**

MEMBERS PRESENT:

**John Gargan
Peter Paino
Amanda Edwards
Doria Daniels**

ABSENT:

Anthony Catalano

STAFF PRESENT:

**Jennifer Barone, Development Engineer
Eric Fink, Assistant Law Director
Bridget Susel, Community Development Director
Gene Roberts, Public Service Director
Sheila Uzl, Transcriptionist**

I. Call To Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

MOTION: *Ms. Daniels moved to excuse Anthony Catalano's absence from this meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Edward. The motion carried 4 – 0.*

II. Roll Call:

Mr. Gargan, Ms. Daniels, Ms. Edwards, and Mr. Paino 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

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."

V. Correspondence

A memo from the Department of Public Service Division of Engineering was received regarding 345 Flats project.

VI. Old Business

Mr. Paino asked that the sight distance guide line for 345 Flats could be discussed.

Ms. Barone stated it could not be discussed tonight because it was not on the agenda but could be on next month's agenda.

VII. New Business

**A. PC16-003 Kent Police Station
 200 East College Avenue
 Conditional Zoning Certificate & Site Plan and
 Comprehensive Package**

- 1) The applicant is requesting a Conditional Zoning Certificate and Site Plan Review and Approval in order to construct a 33,750 SF police station. The building will house offices and holding cells.**
- 2) The applicant is requesting approval of the Comprehensive Sign Plan for the Police Station consisting of two monument signs, two wall mounted signs and one blade sign.**

Jeff Meyers (136 North Water Street, Kent, OH) stated he is an architect from DS Architecture. He said they have been working with the City of Kent's Planning and Engineering Divisions. He said they have received a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Architectural Review Board as well as approval from the Board of Zoning Appeals for the variances they requested. He reviewed the plans and showed the location of the police station as it relates to the roads it will be adjacent to. He said there will be a bike trail along the north side of the building. The plan does not show the College connection to Tonkin. The Tonkin Court extension is a separate project. He said the landscaping plan will consist of natural Ohio plants including trees, low shrubs or tall shrubs. This building is required to attempt to achieve Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Silver Rating. There will be a large detention pond. He showed the location of the access points and the sally port, a secure controlled entryway. He also showed where the employee parking will be for the police cruisers. He said they have faced a couple hurdles. One hurdle is that the site is in two different zoning districts and another is that the site has a topography change of over 20 feet from the corner Haymaker and Depeyster to the opposite southeast corner. There is a passage way that allows people from downtown to pass through the building from the parking lot. The building will be ADA compatible. He said the exterior will be masonry that will be smooth and split face block with terra cotta colored panels. The fire trucks will have access to the site. He said the Comprehensive Sign Package include two identical monument signs, two building signs, pressed metal panel blade sign and directional signage. He showed the location of the signs.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Ms. Barone stated that the building will be located in two zoning districts, C-D: Commercial-Downtown and the R-4: Multifamily Residential District. It is a permitted use in the C-D zoning district and a conditionally permitted use in the R-4 zoning district. She said Mr. Meyers did a good job presenting the project. There were three conditions for a conditional use which have been met except for not being located next to a residential use but they received a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals. The site can be accessed from South Depeyster Street, East College Avenue or Tonkin Court. The required number of parking spaces is 55 spaces but the applicant received a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals for 53 spaces. They are required to have three bicycle racks. A four (4) bicycle rack will be installed in the plaza. There are utilities in the area with the sanitary and storm mains being rerouted around the proposed building. There is adequate capacity for the project. A detention basin is proposed for stormwater management.

They are asking for five signs and requesting approval of a Comprehensive Sign Plan. There will be parking lot lighting, wall mounted lighting, canopy lighting and bollard fixtures.

The landscaping code requires 23 trees, 70 low shrubs or 47 tall shrubs. The landscaping plan shows 92 trees and 428 low shrubs. The landscape requirement is being met. A screened dumpster will be along the south side of the entrance off of South Depeyster. The Architectural Review Board issued a Certificate of Appropriateness contingent upon four conditions. The Board of Zoning Appeals approved six variances.

Staff believes the zoning requirements have been made. She said staff suggests making two different motions; one for the approval of the Conditional Zoning Certificate and Site Plan and another for the Comprehensive Sign Plan. She said there are conditions that staff felt should be attached to the approval of Conditional Zoning Certificate and Site Plan: 1) Approval of the landscape design and details by the Arborist 2) Review and approval of the technical plans 3) Consolidation of the lots before construction begins.

Ms. Barone then discussed the Comprehensive Sign Plan. She said the standards of what is required for approval of a sign plan are listed in the staff report. The Architectural Review Board issued a Certificate of Appropriateness. She said no variances will be required if the comprehensive sign plan is approved by the Planning Commission. She said staff found that the proposed development, as presented on the submitted application, plans and specifications is in accordance with zoning requirements. Two conditions are listed in the staff report: 1) obtain a zoning permit within two (2) years of Planning Commission approval. 2) Obtain a sign permit and submit the performance guarantee prior to installation of the signs.

Mr. Fink stated that because this is a municipal building, it has a specific set of criteria that need to be fulfilled for the community. The courts have found that some of the requirements might be required for safety.

Ms. Daniels stated that the design meets with what voters were approving in the tax increase. She said the architectural design is up to the architects. She said it shows efficiency and does meet the jail standards. There is public parking that meets the ADA requirements. Bike racks will be provided as well as parking for police vehicles. She said there are storage and evidence rooms and lockers. She saw no problem with the plan.

Mr. Paino stated he did not see anything wrong with the site plan. He did not like the small plans and was disappointed that the commissioners had not received larger plans sooner to give them time to review them. He would have preferred full scale drawings.

Ms. Barone replied she thought the smaller plans were legible enough. She said they will have larger ones from now on.

Mr. Paino said he was not really able to look at anything on the small plans. He asked what happens when Tonkin Court goes down to College Avenue and what the grade would be when it goes in.

Gene Roberts, Service Director, replied it would be 8 percent or below. He said they would cut one end and raise the other. He said the long term plans is to rebuild College in the future. He said two apartment buildings are staying and their ingress and egress have to be considered. He said it will cost \$760,000 to upgrade Tonkin.

Ms. Edwards wanted to confirm that the bike racks will be under the overhang, off the bike path.

Ms. Barone replied there will be a bike trail along Haymaker toward the intersection of Haymaker and Depeyster, and it will be under the overhang.

Ms. Edwards asked if the 3-D movie on the web is the same concept of this project.

Mr. Meyers replied the design is mostly the same with upgrades in design. None have been developed.

Ms. Edward stated all of the walkway from the front to back elevation is very similar.

Mr. Meyers agreed and stated it was more developed.

Mr. Gargan stated it is an efficient use of the space. He confirmed that there is no third floor for City Hall.

Ms. Susel addressed some comments made by Ms. Daniels. She said the site plan criteria was met.

Ms. Barone asked if everyone was alright with the Comprehensive Sign Plan.

Mr. Gargan asked if there would be lighting behind the blade sign.

Mr. Meyers replied that there is a change from applied letters to perforated; yes, there will be lighting.

Mr. Paino confirmed that there will be two ground signs and two building signs and a blade sign for a total of five signs.

Mr. Meyers responded that was correct.

Mr. Gargan asked if the signs would be lit per the zoning code.

Mr. Fink replied yes that the goal was to get lights in there. They want you to be able to see the Kent Police sign all the way from Buffalo Wild Wings. That's why they want it vertical.

Ms. Edwards asked if the only sign that could be seen from Haymaker heading west would be the blade sign.

Mr. Meyers replied yes.

Ms. Edwards stated that it is a good idea to have it lit because it is the only sign seen on Haymaker.

Mr. Meyers stated that there also lights in the under pass. There is a training room which can double as a community room. He said the glass windows will also help light the building to make that corner softer.

Mr. Paino asked if the blade sign would be one sided.

Mr. Meyers replied yes as requested by the Architectural Review Board

There were no other comments. Mr. Gargan asked for a motion.

MOTION: *Ms. Edwards moved that in Case PC-16-003, Kent Police Station, property located at 200 East College Avenue, that the Planning Commission approves the Conditional Zoning Certificate and Site Plan. Subject to the following conditions:*

- 1) Approval of the landscape design and details by the City Arborist*
- 2) Review and approval of the technical plans*
- 3) Consolidation of lots.*

The motion was seconded by Mr. Paino The motion carried 4 –0.

Mr. Gargan asked for a motion on the Comprehensive Sign Plan.

Mr. Fink asked for clarification from Mr. Paino on his vote for the sign plan.

He said he voted in favor. The vote is 4-0.

MOTION: *Ms. Edwards moved that in Case PC-16-003, Kent Police Station, property located at 200 East College Avenue, that the Planning Commission approve the Comprehensive Sign Plan subject to the following conditions:*

- 1) *Obtain a zoning permit within two (2) years of Planning Commission approval.*
- 2) *Obtain a sign permit and submit the performance guarantee prior to installation of the signs.*

The motion was seconded by Mr. Paino. The motion carried 4 –0.

VIII. Meeting Minutes - Approval of Verbatim Transcript – February 2, 2016

A lengthy discussion was held on the University Oaks project and the upcoming court case.

MOTION: *Ms. Daniels moved to approve the Verbatim Transcript of February 2, 2016 as amended. The motion was seconded by Ms. Edwards. The motion carried 3 – 0. (Mr. Paino abstained)*

IX. Other Business

- A. Eric will discuss oil wells and the Munroe Falls and Cuyahoga Falls law suit at the next Planning Commission meeting.
- B. It was suggested that the discussion on the Driveway Sight Distance Analysis for 345 Flats be placed on the next Planning Commission meeting and that a motion be made to table this discussion.

MOTION: *Mr. Paino moved to place the discussion on the Driveway Sight Distance Analysis for 345 Flats on the next Planning Commission meeting at which time it will be discussed with all updates. The motion was seconded by Ms. Edwards. The motion carried 3 – 0. (Ms. Daniels abstained)*

X. Adjournment

Ms. Daniels will not be at the March 15, 2016 Planning Commission meeting.

Motion: *Ms. Daniels moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Mr. Paino. The motion carried 4 – 0.*

The meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.