

**PLANNING & DESIGN COMMISSION  
CITY OF NORTH OLMSTED  
MEETING MINUTES OF JANUARY 26, 2011**

**ROLL CALL**

Mrs. Meredith called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in Council Chambers and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Present: Melissa Meredith, Greg Malone, Ralph Bohlmann, Don Rerko

Absent: Robert Parry, Jim Cotner

Staff: Planning and Development Director Kimberly Wenger, Assistant Law Director Bryan O'Malley, City Engineer Pietro DiFranco, Clerk of Commissions Donna Rote

**REVIEW AND CORRECTION OF MINUTES**

**Mrs. Meredith moved, seconded by Mr. Malone, to approve the Planning and Design Commission minutes of January 12, 2011 which was approved 4-0.**

**NEW BUSINESS**

**CMS10-35: Gyro George; 30791 Lorain Road**

Representative: George Glyptis, owner

Ms. Wenger said the project consists of building modifications which were made without permits or prior approval. The applicant painted the brick building white and the roof shingles blue in 2009, after the applicant was cited by the building department, an application for a minor change was submitted and denied December 2009. The owner was advised to return the building to its original state or seek approval from the Commission. In October 2010 the applicant submitted an application, and a property maintenance inspection was conducted which revealed a number of ongoing property maintenance issues. She is concerned with the current condition of the site and continual occurrence of property maintenance issues. Mr. Mitchell noted a number of property maintenance concerns including, a neon sign in the window, dilapidated fencing, damaged dumpster enclosure, unkempt landscaping and the dumpster being housed outside the enclosure. Mr. O'Malley reviewed the difference between property maintenance issues, the minor change process and deviations from approved plans. He advised the commission the entire site was before them for review.

Mr. Glyptis said he was not aware a permit was required to paint his building or he would have applied for a permit first. The building had graffiti across the back which needed to be addressed. The colors chosen match the other four locations which are the Greek colors white and blue. The white and blue colors are corporate colors, which he would like to retain. Mrs. Meredith voiced her concern that it took the owner a year to apply to address the violations.

Mr. Rerko said the original look of the building was better than the state it currently is in. Due to the brick being painted it would be very difficult to go back to the natural brick. Therefore the shingles should be replaced as the painted shingles which were already in poor condition

will deteriorate quicker than it would typically. There are blue slate shingles which are available that would not be as bright and would tone the building down. The building also needs to be repainted. The current paint condition is very splotchy and various areas are bleeding through. Installing canopies over the window and entrance door will help the building blend with the residential surroundings. The conditions of the fence and dumpster enclosure area are such they should be replaced and the neon sign removed from the window. Mr. Malone agreed with Mr. Rerko and said the landscaping appearance throughout the site was inadequate for a commercial site. There is no buffering along the residential property line and there is no entranceway landscaping. Existing landscaping is in very poor condition including retaining walls. The landscaping needs to be completely renovated. Mr. Bohlmann felt the colors do not blend into the residential neighborhood and suggested darker colors due to the proximity to residential homes. Mr. Glyptis said the Commission's comments sound discriminatory. The building and fence was full of graffiti and painting the building improved the site and it now matches all other restaurants he owns. Mr. Bohlmann assured the applicant any site in such poor condition would be addressed in the same manner. The fence is dilapidated and should be replaced with a board on board or vinyl fencing including the dumpster enclosure. There are a number of issues on the site which needs to be addressed including whether or not a sidewalk is required. Mr. O'Malley said that issue would need to be researched. Mr. Bohlmann said the painted brick does not match those of the neighboring sites which are brick and asked if the paint could be removed. Mr. Rerko said if the building was sandblasted to remove the paint the brick would be damaged. A discussion ensued regarding other products than sandblasting to remove the paint which would only have minimal damage. There are also products to use over brick to graffiti proof them.

Mrs. Meredith noted that the Warrensville building shown in the photo had brick which wasn't painted. The commission has been placed in an awkward position by the applicant due to the fact that the work was completed without permits or prior approval. The recommendations of the commission are to replace the roof shingles with a blue slate, repaint the building, add black fabric awnings over the window and door, place shutters on either side of the window, a new enhanced landscaping plan for the site, replace the existing fence and dumpster enclosure and maintain the dumpster within the enclosure. Mr. Bohlmann said fencing and landscaping should be placed along the border of the residential property. Mr. Glyptis said he was overwhelmed as he thought he was present only to address the color of the building and it's turned into negotiations which he is not prepared for. He said he was not sure if he needed legal assistance or not and Mr. O'Malley said the applicant was welcome to postpone further discussions and return with legal counsel. Mr. Glyptis said he was not prepared to discuss fencing, landscaping, dumpster enclosure and other things brought up as his budget is limited. Mrs. Meredith explained the Commission's role of taking what has been done and try to minimize the adverse impact created upon the neighborhood. Mr. Bohlmann asked the building official to research if a sidewalk is required. Ms. Wenger said the condition of the fence was such that it should be entirely replaced with either a board on board or vinyl style fence. Mr. O'Malley said addressing property maintenance issues was not something which could be negotiated they must be rectified. Mrs. Meredith asked how the applicant would like to proceed. Mr. Glyptis said he would like to be tabled so he could look into the suggestions made.

**Mr. Rerko moved, seconded by Mr. Bohlmann, to table CMS10-35: Gyro George of 30791 Lorain Road with a return date before the commission of no later than March 23, 2011, which was approved 4-0.**

**CMS10-36: North Olmsted Town Center Building B; 24800 Brookpark Road:**

Representatives: John Crook, Joe Khouri, and Steve Edelman with Carnegie Management

Ms. Wenger said the lot is zoned Mixed Use D and reviewed the Commission's role in reviewing detailed development plans. Council denied the applicants plan amendment to eliminate the second floor office component of the previously approved plan. The current plans show the office component retained however the size, shape and orientation of the Building B have changed. The building footprint has slightly increased. The building was shifted back from Brookpark Road to accommodate front parking for the two retail tenants. Preliminary recommendations included implementing stormwater quality through bioretention including plantings in the front landscape setback area to screen parking; add more greenspace; consider parking bump-outs or adding more vegetation near the building, providing a dumpster enclosure or screening dumpster area, provide bike racks, list all bioretention plants, provide material samples and submit a master sign plan. Mr. Mitchell said no variances would be required as the proposed changes fall within what was previously granted.

Mr. Bohlmann recused himself from discussions pertaining to the proposal. The board no longer had a quorum and therefore could not vote on the matter. The Commission and applicant agreed to discuss the project without a vote so recommendations could be addressed prior to the next meeting.

Mr. Rerko said the second floor elevations show possible sign locations, however if the signage is not placed in the location more elements are needed on the façade. Mr. Crook said if the signs are not placed in the locations shown there would do something appropriate in the area. Mr. Rerko requested an elevation showing the elevations without signage. The truck dock is not shown gated which should be. Mr. Crook said there is a self enclosed dumpster allowing a truck to nose in and the enclosure is masonry with gates. Mr. Malone asked for a detailed plan of the bioretention cells and said many of the plants being used throughout the site could be used within the cells without worrying about their survival.

Mr. Crook said they are seeking approval to proceed with constructing Building B. Upon final approval they will submit landscaping, engineering, building, photometric, utility and construction plans. There will be two tenants which makes storefront parking paramount. All setbacks are the same just the curb line is being extended. All service and deliveries will be made in the back of the building and delivery areas are screened with landscaping. The second floor space will remain a shell until space is leased. The architectural appearance will match that of building C and D in materials and colors. There will be two types of solid colored awnings used. The building fits into the center and will be cohesive to the site. Mrs. Meredith asked if there would be entrances along the east or west ends of the building and Mr. Crook said no. Two bike racks were added and additional landscaping along the front. Mrs. Meredith asked how much of the office space above Building D was occupied and Mr. Crook said it is 40,000 square feet of vacant space.

Mrs. Diver asked about the setback from Brookpark Road and inquired about building C and D's occupancy status. Mr. Crook said the setback of the building would be 96 feet from the right of way. Mr. Khouri reviewed the status of buildings C and D and their efforts to fill their buildings. Mrs. Diver asked if there would be elevators in Building B and Mr. Crook said there would be a center corridor in the lobby with a staircase and elevator. Mr. Skoulis asked if there were tenants for the new building and Mr. Crook said there are two tenants which will be on the first floor. Mr. Malone said he would like to see the bioretention cells submitted for review. Mrs. Meredith said the Commission also wanted to see the plan alternative showing the building details to be used if the signs are not placed as shown. A master sign package is also required to be submitted for the building. Mr. O'Malley reviewed the intent of the required master sign package. Mr. Crook said there was currently no sign package designed. Ms. Wenger said she would work with the applicant on a sign package.

## COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Wenger said there would be ordinances which will be going before council addressing various clerical updates to each of the Board and Commissions chapters which would be forwarded to all members.

**Mrs. Meredith moved, seconded by Mr. Rerko, to excuse the absence of Mr. Parry which was approved 4-0.**

## ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

---

Melissa Meredith, Chair

---

Donna Rote, Clerk of Commissions

---

Approved