

# DRAFT

**MINUTES  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
SEPTEMBER 6, 2018  
LAKEWOOD CITY HALL  
7:00 P.M.  
AUDITORIUM  
(Recording is available)**

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

1. Roll Call

Members Present

Kyle Baker  
Glenn Coyne, Vice Chair  
Lou McMahon  
Monica Rossiter

Others Present

Katelyn Milius, City Planner, Secretary  
Bryce Sylvester, Director of Planning and Development  
Jennifer Swallow, Chief Assistant Law Director  
Mark Papke, City Engineer  
Michael Molinski, City Architect/Building Commissioner

A motion was made by Mr. McMahon, seconded by Mr. Coyne to **EXCUSE** the absence of William Gaydos. All of the members voting yea, the motion passed.

2. Approve the Minutes of the August 2, 2018 Meeting

A motion was made by Mr. McMahon, seconded by Ms. Rossiter to **APPROVE** the minutes of the August 2, 2018 meeting. Mr. Baker, Mr. McMahon, Ms. Rossiter voting yea, and Mr. Coyne abstaining, the motion passed.

3. Opening Remarks

The Commissioner members agreed to waive the reading of the Opening Remarks.

**NEW BUSINESS  
CONDITIONAL USE**

4. **Docket No. 09-24-18  
14233 Detroit Avenue  
~~Lucky Sparrow Tattoo~~ / Chronic Tattoo**

Anthony DeRigo, Chronic Tattoo ~~Lucky Sparrow Tattoo~~, applicant requests the review and approval of conditional use permit in order to open a tattoo and piercing establishment, pursuant to section 1129.02 - principal and conditional permitted uses and section 1161.03(z) - body art establishments. The property is located in a C2, Retail district. (Page 3)

Anthony DeRigo, Lucky Sparrow Tattoo, applicant was present to explain the request.

Ms. Milius outlined the requirements. The Planning Commission members ("members") inquired about the staff, number of customers per day, days of operation, disposal of waste.

Public comment was closed. Administrative staff said there were no concerns as long as the establishment's operations met and maintained the requirements of 1161.03(z). The members had no further questions.

## DRAFT

A motion was made by Mr. McMahon, seconded by Ms. Rossiter to **APPROVE** the request as presented. All of the members voting, the motion passed.

### PLANNED DEVELOPMENT

8. **Docket No. 09-28-18**  
**14519 Detroit Avenue**  
**One Lakewood Place**

George Papandreas, Carnegie Management and Development Corp., applicant requests the review and approval of a mixed-use development consisting of approximately 180,000 square feet of commercial space, 200 multifamily units, .5 acres of public space and a structured parking solution providing at least 710 parking spaces, pursuant to section 1156 – planned development. The property is located in a C1, Office district. (Page 52)

Bryce Sylvester and Katelyn provided an introduction to the project. The planning process was expected to last several months. The primary focus of the meeting would be the proposed uses element.

George Papandreas, Executive Vice President, Carnegie Management and Development Corp., applicant, David Parrish, RDL Architects, and Raymond Lloyd were present to explain the various aspects of the project.

Michael Molinski outlined the development objectives and design processes.

Members asked for details about storm water management, dedicated parking spaces of the liner units, bicycle/pedestrian infrastructure, number of proposed parking spaces, pedestrian bridge, specifics of alleyway, winter garden, green space, ADA parking location, attached garages for residential units, snow removal, daytime and nighttime population, number of for sale and rental units, and where will the refuse collection be done for the residential units.

Public comment was taken. Members had additional questions: number of required spaces, Uber drop-off on site, charging stations. The questions presented by the Planning Commission and the public were answered as follows by Mr. Papandreas, Mr. Parrish, and administrative staff:

- How do residents access the liner units along the garage?
  - The configuration is a work in progress that will be addressed in the future. The current parallel parking spaces on Marlowe Avenue will remain.
- Are there two levels to the pedestrian bridge? How does it work?
  - No decision has been made as to if there will be one or two levels. It depends on the tenants.
- Is the east/west service alley a dedicated right-of-way or private drive?
  - No decision has been made at this time.
- What is the concept of the winter garden?
  - It is a descriptive term of a circulation lobby that serves multiple purposes. Within it would be escalators and/or elevators. Part of it would serve as an indoor dining patio for the restaurants. Essentially it is a four-season room. It acts as a central spine for the vertical and horizontal surfaces.
- Were there attached garages on the residential units, would the garages be visible from the street?
  - There are attached garages that would be access from the back driveway, not Belle or Marlowe. The garages would not be seen from Marlowe or Belle Avenues; there would be a front porch with stairs and/or stoops allowing entrance to a front door.
- Is there an estimation of daytime and night time population?
  - Those numbers would be dependent upon the tenants.

## DRAFT

- Is there a breakdown of rental versus sale of the properties?
  - There is not a breakdown at this time, but there is a quota that must be met requiring fee ownerships.
- Regarding the top level of the parking garage; is there flexibility for its use, and could there be a green space?
  - As the design evolves, the intent is to incorporate a green space including on top of the residential units.

Ms. Milius stated there were several questions about traffic, and its impact would be examined fully in a traffic impact study.

- How many entrances and exits to the site were planned?
  - There were four access points to the development, plus four access points to the garage. This will be addressed in the traffic impact study.
- How is refuse collection to be handled?
  - No plans have been finalized.
- What were the specifics about ADA parking?
  - No plans had been finalized.
- Are there design considerations to counter vehicular headlights affecting the surrounding residential areas?
  - The design of the units prevents headlight spillage onto the surrounding residential areas. If an issue were to arise onto the southern edge into the back yards on Belle and Marlowe Avenues, a buffer would be provided. This was a design feature that was yet to be determined, along with landscaping.
- What are the setbacks of the residential units?
  - Along with front porches, landscaping will be integrated into the streetscape on Belle and Marlowe Avenues.
- Regarding demolition of the former Lakewood Hospital, what are the work dates, hours and days of the week?
  - The demolition dates have not been set but are expected to commence this winter. Abatement of the building will start this fall (2018) and will be done by a qualified contractor. The hours allowed are 8:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday – no work is allowed on Sundays or Holidays. Mr. Sylvester stated the city will contact the immediate neighborhood around the site to schedule a specific construction activity meeting.

Ms. Milius said there will be a photometric study to address any lighting issues, such as light intrusion upon the residential properties.

- What about the minimums that were seen in the term sheets originally versus the square footage and number of proposed units?
  - The current numbers reflect what were planned originally in the Carnegie proposal. The numbers presented in the term sheet are set up as minimums for the site.
- When were the two Marlowe Avenue homes purchased, and what was the process?
  - Carnegie stated homes came into contract within the past thirty days and are subject to review, due diligence investigations, and forward movement of the development.
- Was there a deadline for public comments?
  - There is no deadline for public comments. If received before the meeting, they will be acknowledged and read. If after the meeting, they will be presented at the next Planning Commission meeting.
- Has there been thought to reduce vehicular driving and scale of parking on the site?

## DRAFT

- This has been a fundamental consideration and much thought has been put to making it a pedestrian-friendly site, including bicycle stations, integration of public transportation.
- Have single-family homes been considered on the southern side of the site?
  - There is flexibility in that option but (the developers) are not in the position to address it at this time.
- Due to there being more single-family homes on Marlowe Avenue that start immediately south of the commercial corridor on Detroit Avenue which differ from those on Belle Avenue, please address the concerns regarding the retail and six-story height of the building with little setback.
  - Carnegie and RDL will examine the issue further.
- Would they be able to save the façade and incorporate it into the design?
  - If the façade were saved, they could not deliver the half acre front community space. There would be a question of the integrity of the wall. The Curtis Block building would represent the historical aspect of the project. The developer attempted to incorporate the façade into their design – a colonnade in the corner and use of brick as pavers; use of the actual façade would be problematic.
- How many stories of the buildings were there?
  - Along Detroit Avenue would be two levels of retail and four levels of office space. The center portion of the apartment building would have nine stories. The flats would have three stories. A portion of two stories of the parking garage were below grade, as permitted by the topography.
- Would the garage be allowed for public use, would it be available 24/7?
  - Parking was required for the office, retail and residential components. There will be a significant portion designated to public use. Parking would be available all of the time. Additionally, parking would be available for use by the Cleveland Clinic. As part of the city's agreement with Cleveland Clinic, 75 spaces were allocated to the clinic.
- From the residential component, what market sector are you attempting to attract?
  - Millennials, families, young professionals, and empty-nesters.
- Who owns the property?
  - It is owned by the City of Lakewood and would be transferred to Carnegie Management.
- How will the rent and mortgages fit into the surrounding neighborhood?
  - Unsure at this time. There is a prediction of the rental rates, and idea of the fee ownership prices. Mortgage rates would be up to the individual financing. Rental rates are competitive; this will be an upscale product. Surrounding property values will be increased.
- Is there an estimation of the number of additional students who will attend Grant Elementary School?
  - Unknown at this time, research will be done.
- How will noise emitted from the public space be controlled? What about noise from the garage, and its effect on the adjacent neighborhood? What about noise from the condominiums, and the effect on the neighbors to the south?
  - Potential noise issues will require further study. However, the liner units and garage structure should be a buffer to prevent noise trespass.
- Has there been consideration for a designated UBER location?
  - It's a great idea.
- What about a charging station?
  - It's already a consideration for the site.
- Is it feasible to advertise the upcoming meetings in the city's water bill or posting of a notice in the library?
  - Those are good ideas and will be explored.

Mr. Sylvester commented on the question about the number of required parking spaces on the site. Determination for the number of parking spaces will be discussed in depth at future meetings. Regarding

## DRAFT

the privately-owned parking garage behind Center North, the city was aware of its need for repairs and had notified the owner. It was not part of the current project.

- Will the proposed plaza remain privately owned?
  - Yes. There are clauses in the agreement which state the plaza will remain a public use space.

Mr. Sylvester addressed issues raised in e-mail submitted to Planning:

- “Why was the information available utilizing social media exclusively? Why wasn’t an effort made to insure that all Lakewood residents were made aware of the development plans?”
  - Expanding on an earlier comment about public notice letters and the website, other avenues of communication will be explored. He maintained the best way to get updates was to register one’s e-mail on the website.
- “Who owns the property – the city of Lakewood or Cleveland Clinic?”
  - The city owns it currently and will be transferred to the developer.
- “Will hospital building demolition be paid using Lakewood taxpayer money?”
  - No. Per the master agreement with the Cleveland Clinic and the Lakewood Hospital Association set aside \$7,000,000 for the redevelopment of the project. The money will be used for demolition and inside preparation work.
- “Is it true that the developer will only need to pay \$1.00 for the property?”
  - The developer will pay a nominal amount to the city. The fair market appraisal of the property was \$5.2 million. The cost of the abatement and demolition was \$7 million. The site does not have value.
- “What is going to happen to the homes on the blocks of Belle and Marlowe located between Detroit and Franklin?”
  - They will remain single privately owned family homes.
- “If homes need to be demolished to allow space for the development, will the current residents be adequately compensated for their property?”
  - No additional homes will be taken.
- “The project plan indicates that 5 acres of public space will be used in addition to the 180,000 square feet of commercial space, 200 multi-family units, and the 710 car garage. Therefore, what are the boundaries of the entire project? How far will it expand in each direction?”
  - There might have been a typo as the plan is for a half-acre for the public space.
- “How will construction be managed to minimize damage to streets from heavy equipment, noise pollution, and particle pollution from the building demolition?”
  - A construction management plan will be developed, and a community meeting will be scheduled.
- “Once the project is completed, how will traffic be managed...?”
  - Traffic will be addressed through the traffic study.
- “Does the Planning Commission have any commitments from commercial space tenants?”
  - The developer had started to do outreach for retail, commercial and brokerage firms.

Responding to a second e-mail submitted to Planning, Ms. Milius said it addressed much the same issues as the previous letter, and questions had been answered already. Both e-mails had been distributed to the members prior to the review meeting and would be made part of record.

Members thanked the applicants and the members of the public for their comments and courteous demeanor. Everyone was reminded of the ABR meeting on September 13th, 2018 when discussion of design would ensue.

## **DRAFT**

A motion was made by Mr. Coyne, seconded by Ms. Rossiter to **DEFER** the item until the meeting of October 4, 2018. All of the members voting yea, the motion passed.

Items 5, 6, and 7 were called together as it is the same project.
---

### **CONDITIONAL USE**

5. **Docket No. 09-25-18**  
**14115 Detroit Avenue**  
**Raising Cane's Chicken Fingers**

Drew Gatliff, RCO Limited, applicant requests the review and approval for drive-through service at the location of a new 3,340 square foot restaurant, pursuant to section 1129.02 - principal and conditional permitted uses and section 1161.03(y) – drive-through facility. The property is located in a C3, General Business district. (Page 19)

### **CONDITIONAL USE**

6. **Docket No. 09-26-18**  
**14115 Detroit Avenue**  
**Raising Cane's Chicken Fingers**

Drew Gatliff, RCO Limited, applicant requests the review and approval for outdoor dining at the location of a new 3,340 square foot restaurant, pursuant to section 1129.02 – principal and conditional permitted uses and section 1161.03(t) – outdoor/seasonal dining facility. The property is located in a C3, General Business district. (Page 30)

### **PARKING PLAN REVIEW**

7. **Docket No. 09-27-18**  
**14115 Detroit Avenue**  
**Raising Cane's Chicken Fingers**

Drew Gatliff, RCO Limited, applicant requests the review and approval of a parking plan at the location of a new 3,340 square foot restaurant, pursuant to section 1143.09 - parking plan review. The property is located in a C3, General Business district. (Page 41)

Drew Gatliff, RCO Limited, applicant was present to provide background to the business and explain the project.

Ms. Milius advised the members there were three different items for the project. At the evening's meeting, administrative staff focused on two of them: The Conditional Use for a Drive-Through Facility – 1161.03(y) and Parking Plan Review – 1143.09. Traffic Impact Analysis and Photometric Study had yet to be provided.

Members commented the front patio enhanced the establishment by giving it more of a restaurant feel.

Public comment was taken. Administrative staff and the applicant addressed questions and issues expressed by the public:

- Traffic concerns about exiting left onto Parkhaven Row; traffic concerns were expanded to Manor Park Avenue and Bunts Road.
  - A traffic study is required.
- Concerns about lighting.
  - A photometric study is required.
- Noise pollution.

## DRAFT

- The applicant stated the majority of the noise came from the menu boards. Drive-through hours were restricted, landscaped screening would buffer the sound.
- The city's design guidelines and standards put the pedestrian and walkability first.
  - If the number of parking spaces were reduced, the employees would then be using the on-site parking spots. Additional landscaping was an option. Crosswalks could be added to the parking lot.
- How many employees per shift were there?
  - 10 to 15.
- Was reuse of the existing building a consideration?
  - It was but it is not designed as a drive-through. 50-60% of the business is drive-through.
- How would you prevent right turns onto Parkhaven Row Avenue when patrons exit the establishment? Could patrons exit onto Detroit Avenue instead?
  - The option had been examined but was found to be infeasible.
- Has there been extensive landscaping at other stores and has it been maintained?
  - Yes to both. Corporate representatives evaluate the stores twice a year.
- Have you considered adding trees?
  - We would be glad to make that part of the plan.

Ms. Milius addressed three e-mails that were submitted to Planning. They had been distributed to the members prior to the review meeting and would be made part of record.

- There would be a lot of trash around the neighborhood.
  - There are dedicated employees who maintain trash on the patio and inside the dining area. Trash cans are placed around for use by patrons.
- There was concern about the smell of fried foods.
  - The exhaust fan is the same as used at other establishments.

Understanding that some of the questions could not be answered, members asked the following:

- What was volume of patrons at peak hours (drive-through versus dining on-site)?
  - Peak time drive-through is 100 cars per hour.
- How long does it take to complete a drive-through order?
  - Three minutes, twenty seconds for some times, and thirty to forty-five seconds per car for peak time.
- Where and when will there be delivery trucks?
- Would there be pedestrian access from Parkhaven Row?
- Is there on-street parking on Detroit Avenue and would it be included in the count?
- Was the ingress on Detroit Avenue and egress onto Parkhaven Row?
  - They were planning two-way traffic from and onto Detroit Avenue and Parkhaven Row.
- The turning radius from Parkhaven Row into the drive-through lane looked tight.
  - The applicant said it was.
- There was potential for right-of-way conflicts.
  - The applicant agreed and said they were considering options.
- What is the typical of car stacking for two-lanes at other stores?
  - It goes from two-lanes for ordering to one-lane for pick-up. Discussion continued about the number of stacked cars.

Again, members thanked the applicants and the members of the public for their thoughtful questions and courteous demeanor. They could expect to see revised plans as a result of the questions and concerns raised about the pedestrian right-of-way. Bike boxes and public art should be incorporated, move the trash enclosure closer to Detroit Avenue.

## DRAFT

A motion was made by Mr. Coyne, seconded by Mr. McMahon to **DEFER** Docket No. 09-25-18, Docket No. 09-26-18, and Docket No. 09-27-18 until the October 4, 2018 meeting. All of the members voting yea, the motion passed.

### ADJOURN

A motion was made by Mr. Coyne, seconded by Mr. Baker to **ADJOURN** the meeting at 10:16 P.M. All of the members voting yea, the motion passed.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date