

**WESTLAKE PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
AUGUST 29, 2005**

Present: Chairman R. Schultz, R. Lancashire, D. Meehan, J. Connole, J. DesForges

Also Present: Planning Director Robert Parry; Assistant Law Director William Huffman;
Assistant Planning Director William Krause, Clerk of Commissions Nicolette
Sackman and Ward 1 Councilman Ed Hack

Discussion of agenda items and fact finding was conducted at 7:00 p.m. The Regular Meeting was called to order at 7:30 P.M. by Chairman Richard Schultz.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. DesForges moved, seconded by Mr. Connole to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of June 27, 2005.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Schultz, Connole, DesForges, Meehan, Lancashire

Nays: None, motion passed

Mr. Lancashire moved, seconded by Mr. Meehan to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of July 11, 2005.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Schultz, Connole, Meehan, Lancashire

Abstain: DesForges

Nays: None, motion passed

Mr. DesForges moved, seconded by Mr. Meehan to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of July 18, 2005.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Schultz, Connole, DesForges, Meehan

Abstain: Lancashire

Nays: None, motion passed

Mr. Connole moved, seconded by Mr. Meehan to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of August 1, 2005.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Schultz, Connole, Meehan

Abstain: DesForges, Lancashire

Nays: None, motion passed

COUNCIL REPORT

Councilman Connole reported on the Council Meeting of August 25, 2005

SELECTED CORRESPONDENCE

Department Reviews: Police – Crocker Park – Bldg. GE & GW

Memo dated August 26, 2005 from R. Parry re: **Crocker Park Bldg. GE & GW**

Memo dated August 25, 2005 from W. Krause re: Sign Plans (**Charter One, North Shore Gastroenterology, Migun**)

E-mail correspondence dated August 26, 2005 from L. Loeser re: **Charter One Bank**

Memo boxscore dated August 25, 2005 from W. Krause re: **TGI Friday's Sign Plan**

Memo dated August 25, 2005 from R. Parry re: **Crocker Park For-Sale Housing Design Guidelines**

E-mail correspondence dated August 29, 2005 from J. Bialosky re: **Crocker Park For-Sale Housing Design Guidelines**

OLD BUSINESS

DOCKET 05-07-68 – Clubhouse Grille, Development Plan Revision, Outdoor Patio, 857 Columbia Rd., S. Schill, rep., WARD 1 – Reconsideration (tabled 7-18/2005)

Mr. Steve Schill was present on behalf of the applicant and explained the applicant wishes to locate the patio on the west elevation because the east elevation provides a view of the parking lot, while the west side of the building has more greenery. A 110' setback is required by code and the applicant is seeking to permit the patio with an 80' setback. This modification was not addressed at the previous meeting when the patio was approved because it was assumed a 70' setback was required.

Mr. Parry advised the restaurant is located in an Interchange Service District which requires a 110' setback rather than the smaller setback required in a General Business District. The west wall of the existing building has a setback 110' so a 30' modification is being requested to allow the patio in the setback area. Mr. Parry advised that other restaurants have received modifications to permit outdoor patios in a setback, i.e. Claddagh, Cheesecake Factory and Houlihan's.

Motion: Mr. DesForges moved, seconded by Mr. Connole to recommend approval of the Clubhouse Grille, Development Plan Revision, Outdoor Patio with a 30' setback modification for the patio to be located on the west side of the building.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Schultz, Connole, Meehan, DesForges, Lancashire

Nays: None, motion passed

DOCKET 05-06-60 – Crocker Park Building GE & GW - Hotel, Market Street, C. Noble, rep., WARD 5 (Tabled 6-6-05; withdrawn by applicant 6-27-05, 7-18-05)

Mr. Chris Noble, Stark Enterprises; Mr. Jack Bialosky, Bialosky & Partners; and Mr. Stan Woelfel, Hotel Valencia were present to review the proposed plans. Mr. Woelfel reviewed revisions to the plans since the last meeting which were: the condo units were moved back 20'; the Market Street elevation first floor was moved south 14' to increase the plaza area; the second floor was stepped back 14' from the first floor; the elimination of the loggia; the creation of additional space at the rear of the building; addition of column elements to the north façade; additional balconies on the west and east elevations; the southeast corner off-set and the addition of windows; brick material being carried up through the building with different color bricks to soften the building; recessed loading docks and service areas. The third through sixth floors were unchanged related to balconies. The interior floor plans presented did not match the revised elevation plans shown (balconies and setbacks) and will be revised to match the exterior elevation plans.

Mr. Parry reviewed his August 26th memo noting that more sidewalk width is desired along parking lot at the southeast corner of the hotel leading to the Trader Joe's plaza. Previously this was 15' wide and now appears to be less than 5' wide. A sidewalk should be added to the west side of the building to provide pedestrian access from the rear of the building along Vine Street past the condos and green space. Other items Mr. Parry reviewed were:

- They have “stair-stepped” the façade of the building vertically along the rear as well as significant vertical and horizontal articulation along both north and south facades;
- various materials proposed consisting of cast stone base, brick veneer, cast stone window sills, some relief with metal panels (colored similar to the lighter stone) and glass windows;
- the need to provide striped crosswalks to Trader Joe's rear entrance from the east parking (area of two handicapped parking spaces) and from the south parking lot (area of the other two handicapped spaces);
- the 3 or 4 storefronts under the pool terrace and condo building should be required to present storefront plans when they plan to occupy the space instead of the solid glass floor to ceiling glass storefronts as shown;
- the hotel entrance is shown as a broad “U” shape of cast stone covering the two brick columns just to the west of the via. This feature looks a little unbalanced and at the same time, a little plain, especially in the view down Main Street as shown on the color perspective. The hotel lobby should be distinguished from the rest of the building and provide an elegant entrance to a boutique hotel located in a massive building;
- the colored renderings and elevations show corner balconies on the upper floors for both the east and west corner rooms in addition to balconies on the Market Street side. The floor plans for floors four, five and six do not show these balconies or window openings – it was noted by Mr. Woelfel that the floor plans will be revised to match the elevation renderings;
- the colored renderings show the façade broken into three distinct levels: a massive lower level with primarily a cast stone base; a middle section of four floors primarily darker red brick, glass windows and many recessed and projecting balconies; and a narrower top floor setback from the lower floors and clad in lighter brick and cast stone accentuating the setback relief.

Discussion ensued that the storefronts will be developed and brought to the planning commission for review and approval as will the hotel entrance. Mr. Noble advised they are able to accommodate comments made by Mr. Parry and submit further revisions. The sidewalk near the Trader Joe's plaza will be 8' in width and Mr. Bialosky will provide documentation of the increase and more gracious transition. The terrace at the southeast corner of the proposal will be further developed and presented to the commission for approval in the future. It was questioned how the second floor above the service area (south elevation), where the kitchen vents are located, will be designed. The area will have louvers, which will be designed once final measurements are calculated, and panels with decorative features explored. It was noted that the south elevation should have richer detail like the north elevation.

The condo units have a corporate feel to them and it was discussed that the elevation design should be revisited with consideration to giving the elevations more of a residential look. The members commended the past revisions made and the tremendous improvements that have been made since the first rendering. Other items were discussed such as where trash for the store tenants under the condo units will be located; the view of the hotel from Main Street; where tenants under the condo units will access the building; the reduction of sidewalk area on Market Street; and the color of the bricks to be used. Mr. Woelfel explained trash for the store tenant units will be located in service areas not accessible to the general public. The hotel will have an elegant entrance and the lobby will be visible from Main Street through the glass panes. The interior of the hotel will be inviting and draw people into the site. The brick material was presented and is similar in color to the materials used for the Trader Joe's building.

Motion: Mr. Meehan moved, seconded by Mr. Connole to recommend approval of the Crocker Park Building GE & GW building with the following conditions and modification:

- 1) condition that the F Block building (east of Trader Joe's) height be no less than 34' with the appearance of two to three stories;
- 2) condition that the tenant storefronts and sign plans on the ground floor of the building are excluded from this approval, including the entrance to the hotel;
- 3) condition that the south elevation is developed further in the area of the mechanical system and design of the louvers;
- 4) condition that the west elevation of the condo units be studied further to add some character and be excluded in this approval;
- 5) condition that the terrace south of Trader Joe's (located adjacent to southeast corner of building) be developed and resubmitted for approval (excluded from this approval);
- 6) condition that a roof plan of mechanical equipment be submitted for approval;
- 7) condition that the approval is based on the elevation renderings and the interior footprints being revised to match with the elevation drawings submitted;
- 8) modification to allow two extra stories in height; and
- 9) modification of 24'9" in height.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Schultz, Connole, Meehan, DesForges, Lancashire

Nays: None, motion passed

**DOCKET 05-02-30 - Charter One, Sign Plan,
30020 Detroit Road, McQueen Sign Co., rep.
WARD 5 (Tabled 4-4-05)**

Ms. Leah Loeser from McQueen sign reviewed revisions made to the proposal. The ATM bright green color surround has been returned to a neutral color, which matches the building façade. The green trim around the entrance doors has been removed and relocated to the interior doors.

Mr. Krause reviewed his August 25th memo and explained with the removal of some of the bright color trim and a wall sign on the north elevation the sign package almost complies with the code other than the additional signage being requested for the north elevation. The commission can allow additional signage on the north elevation since this tenant location is a corner tenant. The proposed ATM signage now complies with the square footage permitted in the code.

Discussion ensued that there have been issues with banks and extra temporary signage that is not permitted. Mr. Connole commented that additional temporary banners should not be put up. Mr. Lancashire questioned why the color green was being used because all the signs on the building are red. He was not in favor of the green color. It was noted that green is a permitted color in the sign criteria for the plaza and tenants across from this building have the color green.

Motion: Mr. DesForges moved, seconded by Mr. Meehan to approve the Charter One, Sign Plan with the following condition and modifications:

- 1) condition that no temporary banners be permitted;
- 2) modification to allow an extra 1.75 sq. ft. of sign area on the east (front) elevation; and
- 3) modification to allow signage on the north elevation.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Schultz, Connole, Meehan, DesForges, Lancashire

Nays: None, motion passed

**DOCKET 05-05-43 - Ordinance 2005-31 –
Rezoning on Westchester Parkway – (6-2-05
referred back by Council; 7-11-05 Requested
120-day extension)**

Mr. Parry reported that the planning commission reviewed this ordinance and made a recommendation on May 19, 2004 to city council. City council referred the ordinance back to the commission after additional comments made by the property owner. The area to be rezoned from R-MF- 24 to Office Lab is made up of 27 acres – 15 acres on the north side of Westchester and 12 acres on the south side of Westchester. As part of the city guide plan review, this area was suggested to be rezoned into Office Lab. To the south of the property is Office Lab zoned land, to the west is the city's leaf and yard waste recycle yard, to the north is the railroad and to the east are townhouses. Mr. Parry advised the property owner has asked that the property not be

rezoned into Office Lab but to R-MF-40 like the adjacent property (9.5 acres) to the east with Ordinance 2005-30.

Mr. Sheldon Burns, attorney for the property owner (Associated Estates), requested that the property in question not be rezoned into Office Lab but to R-MF-40. The property owner did not have any objections to Ordinance 2005-30 which rezoned other adjacent property (9.5 acres) to R-MF-40 and wishes for this 27 acres to be similarly zoned. Currently the land is zoned for multi-family and can permit apartments but it is not their desire to develop apartments and the less dense multi-family zoning of R-MF-40 is not objectionable. He explained that in 2004 the owner was in the process of developing the land and had a letter of interest from Petro Homes to develop the property. They even have a conceptual drawing of how the land might be developed and had started wetland studies. He noted that there are other residential properties surrounding the land such as single family homes on Bryandale and townhouses to the east. The property owner has not been able to find a demand for the property if zoned Office Lab and was unaware a rezoning was being considered until they received notice of a public meeting in May. Currently there is a hold on any potential sale of the land but Petro Home has expressed continued interest in the land if zoned residential. Mr. Burns stated that it is possible that attached or detached single family homes be developed on the land.

Ms. Karen Hanson of 27696 Bryandale questioned if the R-MF-40 zoning is the same as the 9.5 acres that were rezoned in Ordinance 2005-30, the setback requirements and height limitations. It was stated that the zone is the same as the 9.5 acres, which limits the height to 2 ½ stories and what the Bryandale residents had requested. The setback may be 30' or 50' in that zoning district.

Members of the commission discussed that a lot of time went into reviewing the guide plans and the best use of the property. Surrounding properties were reviewed as well as surrounding uses. Mr. Lancashire expressed that office lab was discussed as a better use for the land rather than residential. Previously many of the residents on Bryandale expressed concerns with density of the property in question, use, and street connections to Bryandale. It was questioned if the Bryandale residents were notified of this meeting. Mr. Parry advised that residents within 500' were sent notification of the meeting. Discussion ensued that the members desired more time to review the property owner's proposal because a lot of time and thought was given into rezoning the property to Office Lab.

Motion: Mr. DesForges moved, seconded by Mr. Connole to table Ordinance 2005-31 to September 12, 2005

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Schultz, Connole, Meehan, DesForges

Nays: Lancashire, motion passed

NEW BUSINESS

**DOCKET 05-07-75 – SBC Telephone Cabinet
– above ground, Development Plan, 25136
Center Ridge Road, B. Sterba – rep., WARD 2**

Mr. Courtney Morris from SBC was present and explained they proposed to install an above ground telephone cabinet at 25136 Center Ridge Road. The cabinet is a basic unit that is seen throughout the city. The immediate need for the cabinet is for the new Premier Physicians office building at that location. The cabinet will be surrounded by arborvitae for screening.

Mr. Parry reviewed the proposal noting that the cabinet will be located in front of the parking lot in a 20' x 30' easement, 23' from the eastern property line. It was questioned who will maintain the landscape screening – the property owner or SBC. Mr. Morris advised SBC gives a 1 year guarantee for plant material and if there are problems after one year they try to resolve issues one at a time. Discussion ensued that possibly SBC can contact Premier Physicians to coordinate the landscape material with the landscape to be installed by Premier. It was questioned why that location was selected (in front of the building). Mr. Morris advised the easement location was determined by Premier and the other issue deals with technical interfacing. The easement is larger than the unit and if there were the need to expand in the future, SBC will return for review and approval.

Mr. Ernie Brodie, general manager for Premier Physicians was present and stated that he will work with SBC to coordinate the landscape material. As for the location of the easement, the location was determined by the architect for the project.

Motion: Mr. DesForges moved, seconded by Mr. Meehan to recommend approval of the SBC Telephone Cabinet with the condition that the landscape material/screening design be coordinated with Premier Physicians and maintained by the property owner.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Schultz, Connole, Meehan, DesForges, Lancashire

Nays: None, motion passed

**DOCKET 05-07-76 – North Shore
Gastroenterology Center, Sign Plan, 850
Columbia Road, G. Harris – rep., WARD 1**

Mr. Greg Harris, representative for the applicant, explained the sign proposal is for individual aluminum letters with white Plexi and blue vinyl that will match the existing signage. The letters will appear blue during daylight hours and will internally illuminate (white) in the evening hours. The letters will be mounted on a raceway which will blend with the building.

Mr. Krause reviewed his August 25th memo noting because the building is located in Interchange Service wall signage is permitted facing I-90 and there is no limit to the height it can be mounted on the building. The master sign plan left 42 sq. ft. of sign area unallocated which is the exact square footage of the proposed signage. The proposed sign is to be located above second story windows in the center of the south facing wall. City staff has noted the limited visibility of the proposed sign from certain angles and have concerns that the applicant will approach ODOT to cut down trees in the ODOT right-of-way. A condition of approval could be that no trees be cut down in the ODOT right-of-way as a result of the approval of this sign. Mr. Krause advised a sample chip should be presented to the planning department to ensure that the color will match

the existing sign. Mr. Harris advised that his employer installed the existing sign and the color is an exact match.

Mr. Mr. Ernie Brodie, general manager for North Shore Gastroenterology Center, advised that he made it clear to the property owner that ODOT is not to be approached for tree removal nor will trees on the building property be removed now or in the future.

Motion: Mr. DesForges moved, seconded by Mr. Meehan to approve the North Shore Gastroenterology Center, Sign Plan with the following conditions:

- 1) condition that no trees be cut down in the ODOT right-of-way or the building property; and
- 2) condition that the color blue of the sign match the blue used on the other signage on the building which consists of #2447 white Plexiglas with first surface applied blue #3630-36 translucent vinyl and a sample be submitted to the planning department for comparison.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Schultz, Connole, Meehan, DesForges, Lancashire

Nays: None, motion passed

**DOCKET 05-07-77 – Migun, Sign Plan, 25947
Detroit Road, J. Krizman – rep., WARD 1**

Mr. Krizman, representative for the applicant, explained the proposed signage is for neon channel letters and the overall square footage and colors comply with the sign criteria. However, due to the small size of lettering “Thermal Health Beds”, individual channel letters would be very difficult and expensive to create, plus cause servicing problems. What is proposed is a capsule shape box sign under the word “Migun”

Mr. Krause reviewed his August 25th memo noting the Williamsburg Square sign criteria requires that all exterior signage consist of internally illuminated blue letters. However, there are no provisions in the criteria for internally illuminated capsules (mini-box signs) with white lettering as submitted by Ruff Neon for Migun Thermal Health Beds. The landlord is requesting a minor revision to the approved sign criteria to allow the capsule portion of the sign as submitted. He advised a sample chip should be presented to the planning department to ensure that the color will match the existing signage. Due to the number of letters in the name of the business it may be difficult or impossible to spell out the business name in individual internally illuminated letters. It was discussed that once the old sign is removed the wall should be painted so that any lettering from the old sign is not visible.

Motion: Mr. DesForges moved, seconded by Mr. Meehan to approve the Migun Sign Plan with the following condition and modification:

- 1) condition that the representative submit a sample to the planning department of the proposed #2051 blue and the #2114 blue specified in the criteria to make sure that the two blues are comparable; and
- 2) modification to allow the capsule portion of the sign as submitted.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Schultz, Connole, Meehan, DesForges, Lancashire
Nays: None, motion passed

**DOCKET 05-07-78 – Corrigan, Lot Split,
29517 Lansing Drive, M. Corrigan – owner,
WARD 6**

Mr. Corrigan explained that a large portion of his single family zoned property is not being used and he was approached by a builder to sell a section of it so the builder could build a ranch home for his aging parents. Mr. Corrigan wishes to split his lot into two lots but variances are necessary due to the property line not being radial and the distance his existing house will be from the property line and future home to be developed. The front yard setbacks for lots in this neighborhood are the average of properties within 300', which in this case ranges from 34' to 140'. He is requesting that the front yard setback be 75' so that the 100' width can be met. Farther back from 75' at the estimated average of 87', the lot width is about 97' and becomes narrower farther back to the rear yard.

Mr. Parry advised both lots once split will exceed lot area required but the existing house will be setback 6' off the side property line. The code requires a 15' side yard setback and 30' between houses. The non-radial issue with the lot line can be fixed by adjusting the line and possibly allowing a narrower width at the front yard setback line. The new lot created will be long and narrow at the rear. A number of modifications will be necessary to grant the proposal as requested.

Discussion ensued that two non-conforming lots will be created out of one conforming lot and members were not comfortable with the amount of modifications needed and creating non-conforming lots. The shape of the new lot will be irregular and it was suggested to the applicant to reconsider the lot configuration. The new lot will be able to support a house and the commission wished to see how the footprint of a future house will fit on the lot and the distance from the existing home of Mr. Corrigan. At this time the proposal was *withdrawn by the applicant*.

**DOCKET 05-07-79 – TGI Friday's, Minor
Revision to Development Plan & Sign Plan,
20115 Detroit Road, L. Sherman – rep.,
WARD 5**

Ms. Sherman reviewed the proposed revisions, which are to change the signage and add a new entry tower 25' in height. The new signs will be red, white and black. On the west elevation a feature sign is proposed in the shape of a tumbler. The patio fencing height will be changed to a 3' wall with an 8" planter box on top of a stone cap, which will have plant material inside the planter box. Ms. Sherman presented a color rendering of a different site, showing what the revisions will look like.

Mr. Parry reviewed the proposal and color rendering presented. The new tower will be masonry in a travertine gold color. He explained that red and white awnings are shown too tall in the color rendering and they will be the same size as the existing awnings. The current proposal is to eliminate the internally illuminated awnings and to replace them with opaque red & white externally illuminated awnings with 50 watt fixtures. The new tumbler logo is considered a feature sign.

Mr. Krause reviewed his August 25th memo explaining that feature signs are not permitted in Shopping Center District and only permitted in Crocker Park. The regular sign code does not have a way to calculate the area of a three dimensional sign. The Crocker Park criteria were used to calculate the area of the sign. The applicant indicated this was artwork, but the planning department staff advised it is not considered art work because it is used to advertise the use of the building and if something else were to be there the tumbler would not fit a future use. This tenant can be considered a corner tenant. With the elimination of the internally illuminated awnings there is a reduction of 150 sq. ft. of signage. The black background shown behind the wall sign on the north elevation will not be there and the travertine gold masonry of the tower will be the backdrop. Mr. Krause advised a height modification is necessary for the tower because the height proposed is not permitted in Shopping Center District.

Discussion ensued that feature signs are not permitted within the city other than in Crocker Park. The commission may wish to look at the sign code regarding this issue because approving this proposal could set a precedent. Are feature signs the type of signs the commission would like to see outside of Crocker Park? It was also questioned if the commission can approve something that is not permitted in the code because they are not granting a modification to a code that exists. The applicant stated that the parking lot is contiguous to Crocker Park. Members were aware of that but this is a legal question because what is being requested is not permitted and the members raised concerns with if it can be approved or not. It was suggested that the plan be tabled for review and the applicant was questioned on timeline for the project. Ms. Sherman advised they wish to start in the very near future and wished to have the project complete before winter. It was suggested that approval can be granted for the rest of the proposal with the exclusion of the west elevation and removal of the tumbler, which can come back later. Ms. Sherman advised she can have a revised proposal for the west elevation by the next planning commission meeting.

Motion: Mr. DesForges moved, seconded by Mr. Connole to approve the TGI Friday's Sign Plan as submitted with the condition of the elimination of the feature sign on the west elevation and that nothing appear in place of the feature sign until approved by Planning Commission.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Schultz, Connole, Meehan, DesForges, Lancashire

Nays: None, motion passed

Motion: Mr. DesForges moved, seconded by Mr. Connole to recommend approval of the TGI Friday's, Minor Revision to Development Plan as submitted.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Schultz, Connole, Meehan, DesForges, Lancashire

Nays: None, motion passed

DOCKET 05-07-80 – Crocker Park - Design Guidelines For-Sale Housing in I Block, SW Crocker & Detroit Roads, C. Noble – rep., WARD 5

Mr. Chris Noble, Stark Enterprises; Mr. Peter Rubin, developer; and Mr. Jack Bialosky, Bialosky & Partners were present to review the design guidelines for the Crocker Park for-sale housing in the I Block. Revised guidelines dated August 29th were given to the commission members at the meeting. Mr. Rubin explained that project will be a one of a kind residential development which will be designed around urban gardens. Mr. Bialosky provided a Power Point Presentation showing photos of the different styles of homes and architecture reviewed when creating the design guidelines. They propose to have high levels of details, streetscapes, neighborhood context, courtyards, pedestrian walk through areas, a mix of housing types and styles. The proposed residential style of homes will comprise of possibly six different styles: Romanesque, Shingle (Victorian/Queen Ann), Tudor (European Country), Classical Revival, French Country and Eclectic.

Mr. Bialosky advised that the landscape plans will be designed by the Patti Group and forthcoming. An issue to review is the use or non-use of tree lawns for most of the streets. The estate sized manor homes along the western edge of the development will have tree lawns. In the other areas, the units will be placed closer to the street. If tree lawns are used, front yard space is greatly reduced. Mr. Bialosky said if the sidewalks are located on the curb, there is more usable room for landscape design in front yards. Another concern is that the trees in the tree lawns will be constrained to grow due the small space.

Mr. Parry explained that a number of versions of the design guidelines have been reviewed by staff as well as different types of residential developments in the area. Although different types of housing styles will be used, attention to entrance way and garage door details should be given. Most garages will be located at the rear of the units but the liner units along Dicks will have front loading garages underneath the units. The style of the garage door should be rich in detail. Since there will be on street parking in some areas, consideration should be given to sidewalks on the curbs in some areas. He suggested incorporating trees in tree grates in sidewalks where they are integral with curb; and show a system for locating all street appurtenances. The types of materials to be used should be fine-tuned as to what materials will be used together and with which types of styles. What has been presented is a great start.

Ward 1 Councilman Ed Hack commented the proposal is nice and he is excited about the development and urban greenery. He suggested that on street parking should be addressed so shoppers park in garages and mixed used locations, not on the residential streets.

Mr. Rubin advised that urban greenery will be the focus of the project and they propose different color pallets and fragrant plants for each urban garden. Emphasis will be placed on the urban gardens and details surrounding them. As for parking, they plan to keep the residential parking

accessible to residential visitors and do not plan to use parking meters. They will review enforcement techniques and design the area so that only residential visitors would want to park in the residential area. Discussion ensued that people visiting the Crocker Park retail/mixed use area may not want to park in the residential location and will find the parking garages more convenient and desirable parking locations.

It was suggested listing the different types of housing units (townhouses, row houses, manor houses, liner units, etc.) proposed in the guidelines because certain units are shown in different colors but a legend is not given as to the color coding. It was also questioned how the different architectural styles will be mixed and blended together. The architectural styles are still being reviewed (the proposed six styles mentioned above) and the styles will be finalized with the approval of the guidelines. As each set of development plans come in for review, the architectural styles will be depicted with the unit type and be approved at that time. The guidelines will establish the type of architectural style that will be used throughout the for-sale residential portion of the development.

The traffic pattern into the residential development was reviewed. Most traffic will enter through the main entrances off Crocker Road where traffic lights exist. The different streetscapes were shown with locations indicated in the most recent version of the guideline (received at the meeting). It was suggested to review the basic street layout and infrastructure at the next meeting before approving the design guidelines and development plans. In addition, there were a few items to review and determine in the design guidelines. Items to work on are entrance ways and garage doors; material lists for the various styles to be used; example of level of material and what to prohibit; street appurtenances; tree lawns; tree grates in sidewalks and other minor issues.

Motion: Mr. DesForges moved, seconded by Mr. Lancashire to table the Crocker Park Design Guidelines For-Sale Housing in I Block to the second planning commission meeting from this evening.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Schultz, Connole, Meehan, DesForges, Lancashire

Nays: None, motion passed

MISCELLANEOUS - *None*

Meeting adjourned at 11:00 P.M. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Monday, September 12, 2005 at the Westlake City Hall Council Chambers.

Chairman Richard Schultz

Clerk of Commissions Nicolette Sackman, CMC

Approved: _____