

**MEDINA TOWNSHIP  
BOARD OF ZONING COMMISSIONERS  
REGULAR MEETING  
JULY 17, 2018**

Chairperson Alliss Strogin called the regular meeting of the Medina Township Board of Zoning Commissioners to order at 7:00 p.m. Permanent Board members Kuharik, Apana Overmyer and Strogin were in attendance. Borrer was absent. Mr. Joe Watts sat in for a full 5-member board.

The minutes of the June 20, 2018 Zoning Commission were approved as written. Chair Strogin stated for the record, that the Zoning Commission was a recommending board only, and that all site plans before the Commission this evening would need to obtain final approval from the Board of Trustees. The next meeting of the Trustees will take place on August 9, 2018 at 7:00 p.m.

**SITE PLANS**

**T-Mobile-4184 Pearl Rd.**

Mr. Dave Sterrett from Medina Signs represented T-Mobile signage request. He stated he was before the Commission this evening to request an 8.2 sq. ft. tenant panel to be placed on the existing ground sign.

Mr. Overmyer made a motion to approve the tenant panel for T-Mobile located at 4184 Pearl Rd. not to exceed 8.2 sq. ft. as presented. It was seconded by Mr. Apana.  
ROLL CALL-Overmyer-yes, Apana-yes, Watts-yes Kuharik-yes, Strogin-yes

**Stonegate Self Storage-3741 Stonegate Drive**

Mr. Brian Russell represented Stonegate Self-Storage. He stated he had an option to purchase the parcel located as the corner of Stonegate Drive and Jefferson St. that is currently owned by Ken Cleveland. (There is a letter to be able to represent the proposed usage of this property.) This project would consist of 3 storage unit buildings consisting of 27,000 sq. ft. Of the 27,000 sq. ft. 4,600 sq. ft. would consist of drive up storage and 15,800 sq. ft. would be climate-controlled storage. Mr. Russell stated he was requesting a 50 ft. front yard setback from Jefferson St. and Stonegate Dr. just like the other buildings in the area.

Mr. Russell stated he wanted to put up three self-storage buildings facing Stonegate Dr. There would be no storage doors facing Stonegate Dr. just Jefferson St. The buildings would be constructed in the Western Reserve style.

Chair Strogin the storage units would be facing Jefferson St. and there would be two main door facing Jefferson St. The large main building would be self-contained with two doors onto Jefferson St. and two doors in the back of the building facing west. There will

**Page 2 ZC July 17, 2018**

be two accessory buildings separated by driveways which would be cold storage. The current zoning calls for the buildings to be 80 ft. off the road right of way.

Chair Strogin asked if the building could be moved back. Mr. Russell stated it was a hard piece of property to develop because of the ravine and current setback requirements. Mr. Russell then produced minutes from the Board of Zoning Appeals meeting on April 22, 1996 that read, "Chair Strogin stated for the record that the front yard setback is 60 ft. and this was granted via a variance when Ken Cleveland was developing the Stonegate area and putting in the initial commercial area."

Chair Strogin stated that specific wording was regarding the Social Security Administration building. The information Mr. Russell has provided this evening was the minutes from the BZA meeting of April 22, 1996 regarding variances for the Stonegate development i.e. the northeast corner of Stonegate and Pearl Rd. This does not encompass the property being proposed this evening.

Regarding the topography, Chair Strogin stated yes there is a ravine. The water that came from Home Depot (currently Hobby Lobby) goes underneath that culvert and is piped underneath the parking lot of Walmart and Applebee's and empties out into that ravine. Mr. Russell interjected that he believed the County had an easement for this to occur.

Chair Strogin then asked the proposed height of the buildings. Mr. Russell stated no higher than 11-12 ft. The buildings would have a 1-12 pitch. The walls would be about 8 ft. in height. Chair Strogin stated her concern was the line of site on this corner lot. Mr. Russell stated the property to the north part of Jefferson St. was a dead end street. Chair Strogin stated no, actually it was a stub street so possibly in the future that street could be extended to Fenn Rd. Mr. Russell stated that would be a remote possibility due the location of park land and the existence of the ravine. He added he tried to require more land but with these obstacles it really is not feasible to do so.

Chair Strogin stated right off the stub there is some ground that could house several units. ZI Ridgely stated that land was currently owned by Whitey's. Chair Strogin added that The Medina County Park District put an oil well smack in the middle of the property.

Chair Strogin stated because the front yard setback is 80 ft. the Commission would need to turn this site plan down. Mr. Russell stated he understood and has double filed to be on the BZA agenda tomorrow evening.

Mr. Overmyer made a motion to deny the site plan for Stonegate Self Storage to be located at 3741 Stonegate Drive as it does not meet the Minimum Front Yard Setback requirements of the Medina Township Zoning Resolution on Jefferson St. and Stonegate Dr. as presented. It was seconded by Mr. Kuharik.  
ROLL CALL-Overmyer-yes, Kuharik-yes, Watts-yes, Apana-yes, Strogin-yes.

**Page 3 ZC July 17, 2018****Western Reserve North-4955 Foote Rd.**

Mr. Anthony Cerny from Architectural Design Studios was sworn in. Mr. Cerny stated that this project would consist of new construction resulting in a 21,024 sq. ft. building at the east end of the lot. This construction was proposed on the original master site plan for Western Reserve dated 1/16/07. Mr. Cerny stated the first building was constructed on the south side of the lot and basically now the majority of that building has been filled. There is a prospective tenant that wants to occupy about 21,000 sq. ft. in the proposed new building. The new building would be 2-story but would appear to be a 1-story building from Foote Rd. because of how much the property slopes. The architecture will be the same as the first building. The footprint of this new building has been modified slightly due to the egress requirements under the Ohio Building Code.

Chair Strogin stated in 2007, because the Township permits one main structure on a property, the buildings need to be connected. The site plan that was approved in 2007 showed a covered connection between the two buildings.

Mr. Cerny stated the landscaping plan would be very similar to that of the existing building on the site. The parking requires 240 and there would be 266 spaces provided. The use is medical in nature.

Mr. Kuharik made a motion to approve the site plan for new construction (Western Reserve North, LLC located at 4955 Foote Rd. as presented. It was so noted that this second office building was initially approved on the master site plan dated 1/16/07. It was seconded by Mr. Watts.

ROLL CALL-Kuharik-yes, Watts-yes, Overmyer-yes, Apana-yes, Strogin-yes.

**MISC.**

Chair Strogin stated that at the Commission's last meeting a discussion was started regarding the possibility of changing the area on Rt. 42 only from Fenn Rd. to Brunswick Hills from BL to BG. The BI district is the most intense business district; then BG and lastly BL. It was zoned that way want to feather the districts from the most intense business uses to the lesser intense uses, which then abut the residential districts. The Commission members were all in favor of rezoning the existing parcels on Rt. 42. Chair Strogin stated this change would consist of a zoning code and map amendment.

Secretary Ferencz stated if the Commission were only changing the zoning of the properties and not changing the uses in the BG district, the change would only consist of a map amendment. Dianna Huffman stated the Trustees changed that area to BL for a reason. Chair Strogin stated that the BI District was the zoning closest to the City of Medina to Fenn Rd. That is the area the Township wanted to be developed first. Then the next area to be developed was zoned BG; which was a lesser intense use than the BI to be able to develop north of Rt. 42. This was done at the time that Brunswick Hills Twp. had really no development on Rt. 42. The BG District was developed when the Township did

**Page 4 ZC July 17, 2018**

the rezoning in 1980. She added that Brunswick Hills has started to develop along Rt. 42. The Commission should consider changing the zoning from BL to BG in the zoning on Rt. 42 only from Hamilton Rd. north to the Township limit.

Chair Strogin continued that there were some permitted uses revised in the BG District. Dianna Huffman stated she thought apartment buildings were taken out. Chair Strogin stated it was multi-family which was taken out. Dianna responded that must be what she was thinking of. Chair Strogin stated the district did not change; the multi-family use was taken out of the BG and BL districts in 2004. BI was the only district that allows multi-family.

Dianna Huffman asked the difference of uses between the BG and BL Districts. Chair Strogin responded that the use of restaurants and such establishments was the biggest difference between the two. She then read the uses permitted in the BL and BG Districts. Dianna then asked what the depths were in the BG and BL Districts. Chair Strogin stated in both districts it is 500ft. The only difference between the two districts is the intensity of the uses.

Chair Strogin stated for the record that there is no vote being taken this evening, but the Commission was in agreement to continue the BG District zoning from Hamilton Rd. to the Brunswick Hills Twp. Limit on Rt. 42 only.

Regarding the UR District, Chair Strogin stated at last months meeting she asked the Commission to consider changing the rear yard setback requirements in the UR District.

Chair Strogin stated the UR District allows for ½ acre lots as well as Planned Unit Developments (PUDs). There are two different setbacks required in each piece of that one zone. For the regular UR District, it allows for ½ acre lots, 100 ft. in width with a side yard setback of 15 ft. and a rear yard setback of 30 ft. There has been concern from residents that those setbacks take up too much of their back yard for any accessory structures i.e. sheds or pools. Mr. Overmyer asked what was the reason originally for the size of the lots. Chair Strogin stated not to be derogatory, but the Township did not want to look like Parma and have lots pushed right up against each other. We wanted green space around each and every lot. ZI Ridgely interjected, that it would be nice if the setbacks were consistent. The Commission responded that would be hard to do given the lot sizes are not consistent. In the basic UR District lots are ½ acre. In the PUDs they are ¼ of an acre to a 1/3 of an acre.

After much discussion, the majority of the Commission members were not compelled to change the setback requirements in the UR District that allows for ½ acre lot.

Moving on, Chair Strogin stated in the UR District are Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) In the PUD, the lots are 1/3 acre, 75 ft. wide with a side yard setback of 10 ft. and

**Page 5 ZC July 17, 2018**

a rear yard setback of 30 ft. There is a big difference between the 100 ft. width in the regular UR and the 75 ft. width in the PUD's.

In 1999, we changed the side and rear yard setback in the R2 District, to 10 ft. for sheds under 144 sq. ft. only. For sheds over 144 sq. ft. the rear yard setback is 40 ft. In the R2 District the rear yard setback is 40 ft.

Chair Strogin continued that the variance requests in this particular district appear to be mainly for pools. Those residents are looking at 27, 30, 33 foot circular pools. ZI Ridgely state some of those lots only have a 40 ft. back yard. Chair Strogin added that developers tell their potential clients not to worry about the future elements that may make up their back yard, that the township will grant variances. This should not be the norm especially in the PUD's; as you don't want buildings/structures right of top of one another. Chair Strogin then asked, does the Commission also want to consider setbacks of 10 and 10 ft. for other structures other than sheds? Mr. Overmyer stated he felt this change should be by petition of the residents living in that district. A zoning text change is a significant change and should probably be warranted by those living in those areas of the UR District. Mr. Kuharik interjected that he believed that changing the code would make the properties more attractive to a buyer.

ZI Ridgely stated there is the RR District which is 3+ acres with a 40 ft. setback. Then there is the R-2 District with a 40 ft. rear yard setback as well with lot sizes 1/3 to a 1/4 acre in size. That same setback does not make sense. Mr. Kuharik agreed that it should be changed.

Mr. Watts stated he understood Mr. Kuharik's comment about making the property more attractive to prospective buyers, but would residents really like "things" closer to them?

Mr. Sterrett stated he used to live in Southern California where there were actual 6 ft. high stone walls that divided off each of the pool lots.

Sandy Apana) addressed the board. She stated that she lived in a PUD (Courts of Weymouth) and enjoyed the flow of the green space around each of the lots. Once you start allowing sheds, and gazebo's and pool to interrupt that space you change the whole layout and look of that area.

Chair Strogin stated a home is probably an individual's most costly investment. Most people cannot afford to do everything they want to do with their property when they first purchase it which is understood. However potential buyers do not look at the property; lay it all out on paper and decide if those desired amenities will fit on that property when and if they can be afforded to be done. ZI Ridgely interjected the mindset is the property is mine and I can put a shed, a pool etc. anywhere I want on the property because I own

**Page 6 ZC July 17, 2018**

it. They don't understand setbacks. Chair Strogin stated she understood, but when people spend more research on a phone than their home and property....It is not a good thing.

Mr. Kuharik stated most people buy what they can afford at the time. As life brings changes, or salaries increase they want more or different things on their property. Chair Strogin reiterated her statement about laying out the property and seeing if and when you can make those changes that particular property would be conducive to doing so. ZI Ridgely stated she has a guy coming in tomorrow who lives in Forestview Estates who wants to put a structure in his yard and basically he only has 11 ft. to play with due to the setback requirements. She added the guy nearly dropped the phone when she told him.

Both Trustees Radice and Stopa stated the majority of variance requests were because the rear yard setbacks in the UR are too large and individuals cannot put various accessory structures in their back yards. Trustee Radice stated even if you reduced the setback to 10 ft. one would have 20 ft. all around their property. Trustee Radice added that those individuals who live in the R-2 District are our residents and should be afforded the opportunity to put in sheds/pools on their property if it works.

Chair Strogin stated she has had a conversation with the Chairman of the BZA who believes that round pools are much cheaper than oval pools. She then gave a breakdown of various pools sizes and costs she has written permits for as Zoning Inspector in Lafayette Township. She added she wrote a permit for a 27 ft. round pool for \$7,000. Chair Strogin continued that she also wrote a permit for a 15x30 oval pool which was also \$7,000.00. The difference is the 15 ft. in the width so with an oval pool one does not need that big of a setback.

Mr. Overmyer stated he is of the opinion that when somebody buys a house/property they realize the limitations of that house/property. Mr. Apana stated it was like I want to do this to my property so change the rules.

Moving on the R-2 District, Chair Strogin stated the in the 70's the land that know is known as Forestview Estates was going to be annexed into the City of Medina. It was approximately 200 acres. In order to prevent that from happening, the Township made changes to the zoning in terms of density to be more compatible with the City so as not to lose that land to annexation. In a court settlement, the Township then agreed to the R-2 District. However because the Township did not have a Comprehensive Plan, there was no limit as to where we wanted this density to remain and be developed as such. Mr. Ken Cleveland then built the Stonegate development under the R-2 District regulations. She added it was at that time she ran for Trustee and won. There was no printed zoning resolution, the zoning inspector basically had no authority; and the Township was run like a good old boy network. One of the first orders of business under her tenure as Trustee was to move forward and draft a comprehensive plan to establish the zones of where the Township wanted certain uses to develop. Once the comprehensive plan was adopted, the township went forward and made changes to the zoning resolution to

**Page 7 ZC July 17, 2018**

establish the uses we wanted to permit in each of the different zoning districts. There were two R-2 Districts (only one remains to date at Fenn and Marks Rd.). The other district has to remain even though we took the R-2 District out of zoning code because there are some areas that do exist and that is why that zoning code is at the back of your zoning book.

Chair Strogin stated the 10 ft. side and rear setbacks in the R-2 are for sheds only. Again she asked the Commission if they wanted to change that code to allow for pools as well or to change the setback to 10 ft. and 15ft.; or to change the setbacks to 10 ft. and 15 ft. and open that up to include pools too.

Mr. Kuharik and Mr. Watts stated they would like to change the rear yard setbacks from 40 ft. in the R-2 to 20 ft. Mr. Overmyer and Mr. Apana stated they did not want to change the setbacks. Chair Strogin stated she was little sympathetic on the 40 ft. rear yard setback in the R-2 District. She added she could see the 10 ft. and 20 ft. setbacks in the R-2 District.

Mr. Overmyer then stated he could see the changing the 10 and 20 ft. setbacks in the R-2 District only. ZI Ridgely asked if that would include sheds? Right now the side yard setback and rear yard setbacks are 10 ft. and 10 ft. Mr. Kuharik stated he felt the Commission should leave the sheds alone i.e. leave them 10 ft. and 10 ft. The Commission members agreed. For all other structures the setback would be changed to 10 ft. and 20 ft. in the R-2 District only.

Next was discussion again about the PUD's in the UR District. The setbacks are 10 ft. for the side and 30 ft. for the rear. The Commission questioned consistency of the code regarding the setbacks. ZI Ridgely stated, then make the setbacks in the R-2 District and the PUD's 10 ft. and 15 ft. respectively. It was then brought up that consistency is hard to do because the lot sizes in the R-2 District and the PUD's are different. ZI Ridgely stated how about 10 ft. and 10 ft. for sheds in the R-2 District and 10 x 20 for everything else i.e. decks, pools etc. For the PUD's in the UR make it 10 ft. and 15 ft. as that was where the majority of the variance requests are from. It was stated previously that regarding the regular UR District, the Commission did not want to change those setbacks.

The Commission stated that no formal decisions were being made this evening. Chair Strogin stated she would summarize the changes discussed this evening and would get those to the members either via email or in the packets to be sent out. She added she would like to move forward with these proposed changes at the next Commission meeting.

**Page 8 ZC July 17, 2018**

Having no further business before the Board, the meeting was officially adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kim Ferencz, Zoning Secretary

  
Alliss Strogin Chairperson

C,  
ASK me!  
Just staple  
to corrected  
minutes Kim  
sends. —