

**CITY OF CLEVELAND HEIGHTS
PLANNING COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING
OCTOBER 10, 2018
MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING**

MEMBERS PRESENT:	Craig Cobb	Chair
	Michael Gaynier	
	Adam Howe	
	Anthony Mattox, Jr.	
	Jeffery Rink	
	Leonard Horowitz	
	Jessica Cohen	Vice Chair

STAFF PRESENT:	Richard Wong	Director of Planning
	Elizabeth Rothenberg	Assistant Director of Law
	Kara Hamley O'Donnell	City Planner II
	Christy Lee	Recording Secretary

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Cobb at 5:33 pm. He welcomed everyone to a Special Meeting of Planning Commission and Architectural Board of Review Meeting for the City of Cleveland Heights to review the preliminary development plan of the Top of The Hill Project. Mr. Cobb informed the public that at this time they will not be taking comments from the public, also letting the public know that if they do have questions or concerns, there will be a meeting at the Cleveland Heights Community Center this evening at 7:00pm regarding the Top of the Hill project. Mr. Cobb added that on the next Planning Commission meeting on this topic will be held on Wednesday, October 17, 2018, and the public will have a chance to speak and address any additional concerns then.

Ms. Hamley O'Donnell stated that this meeting was a special meeting being held by the Planning Commission and that, at this meeting, you will have the chance to meet the developer of the Top of the Hill Project who will introduce the project to the Planning Commission and the Architectural Board of Review. All members of the ABR as well as two alternates are present. She went on to speak of the Planned Development Overlay (PDO) District which the Planning Commission will eventually be reviewing and recommending to Council. Ms. Hamley O'Donnell explained the process of the designation of a Planned Development Overlay (PDO) District and shared the draft Development Standards which would be part of the PDO District.

Mrs. Hamley O'Donnell stated that she will be using the feedback today ensure that all concerns are meet and resolved by the Planning Commission. She asked the developer to present their Development Plan and renderings.

Mr. Brandon Bogan, Flaherty & Collins Properties, introduced the Top of the Hill project. He went on to present a slideshow of the entire project and its location. He went on to talk about the central parking structure, the residential wings and the commercial space along Cedar Road as well as the additional parking spaces. He described the lobby that would be the focal point of entry, common space and remaining infrastructure of the project. Mr. Bogan stated that Flaherty & Collins have listened to the community and strive to work with the community.

Ms. Hamley O'Donnell added that the Planning Commission has been working with Flaherty & Collins Properties since early 2018 and have looked at numerous site plans, elevations and have had countless communications about the project. Flaherty & Collins Properties has also had communications with the Cedar Fairmount SID and the Buckingham Condominium board. She also mentioned that they have a Traffic Engineer on board with the project.

Mr. Bogan thanked Ms. Hamley O'Donnell, the Commission and the public, adding that the project plan has continued to evolve with the input they have received. He reiterated that with the different opinions and concerns, they are working very hard to address each one, adding that he believed that this project will be an asset to the community.

Ms. Hamley O'Donnell let the public know that there had been a Design Focus Group, with a number of architects and planners invited to see the initial site plan for the project. At the time, feedback was given and some changes were made as a result.

Mr. Cobb asked if there were any questions at this time.

Melissa Fliegel, ABR, stated that she was at the Design Focus Group meeting and she likes the changes that have been made to simplify the drive, and adding the green space in front of the apartments.

Mr. Bogan stated that was one of the group's major concerns was that the drive design near the Buckingham go back to the original positioning. He added that they have rotated the drive and showed a slide to explain.

Ms. Fliegel stated that she understood the comment, however it is an existing condition and by rotating the drive it also could negatively impact the people that live in the area.

Mr. Bogan stated that if that was the preference of the people, it was fine with the developers. He added that they would take the area that has created a green space near the Buckingham and make some drop-off spots. He stated that the concerns were in regards to the Buckingham residents and how they would load and unload their vehicles, as well as how this would directly affect the distance they would have to get from their cars to their living space.

A member of the ABR asked if there had been a discussion about the traffic at Euclid Heights.

Mr. Bogan stated they there has been discussion about the traffic flow and how it will affect everyone in the area. He went on to explain options that are currently on the table and how to make traffic flow smooth for all.

Ms. Cohen stated that if the median break was to be moved up, that the traffic would be clogged especially during rush hour.

Mr. Bogan stated they are in talks of removing the median break all together, however the current slides don't depict that. He went on to describe how the flow of traffic would be without the median break.

Mr. Horowitz asked where the exact position of the main entrance of the parking garage was. He also asked for a visual of how people are to enter and exit the location of the garage. He asked for clarification on the chart of the parking spaces which showed an extra level of parking from the ground floor to level six.

Mr. Bogan explained and showed a slide confirming the desired point of entrance/exit to the parking garage. He went on to say that it was the grade change with the structure of the parking lot. He explained the number of parking space projected to be in the garage itself. He confirmed that there are five levels and not six.

Mr. Mattox, Jr. asked for clarification on the traffic signal placements within the site.

Mr. Bogan stated they are currently working on a traffic study to better understand the flow of the already existing traffic so that when the project is complete, they will have a best flow for all.

Mr. Horowitz asked where the location for the service vehicles to enter and exit and the where would they park while unloading.

Mr. Bogan reiterated that they are still working through the process of the best location for the entry and exit point. He went on to explain the location of the current entry and exit location and showed a slide for visual. He went on to show and explain where the service vehicles would park while unloading and still allow residents and patrons to move about freely.

Mr. Mattox, Jr. clarified that they will have small passages throughout the site that will allow for service vehicle entry and exit.

Mr. Bogan stated that they won't classify loading docks, but they will allow access to the surrounding business to receive their goods and keep traffic to a minimal. Coordination of times of deliveries will also help with traffic flow.

Ms. Cohen asked for the slide that shows the front of the apartments to be showed again and asked if they all have full glass windows viewing out on the street.

Mr. Bogan stated that they are all full glass apartments, he explained that the actually units haven't been designed yet. But the concept is that each apartment would have a terrace on the side which would be private, but are still in the works of the final details of how the layout would be.

Ms. Cohen asked if there will be a sign put into place put out in the front, introducing this as the entrance to the city and community.

Mr. Bogan he stated that they are currently open to any suggestions at this time from the community about the design concept for a sign. He stated that there has been talk that there should be an entry monument to the site. But, at this time, there isn't anything. This is the reason they are working on the landscape and will bring in landscape architects that will help with the development process.

Ms. Cohen gave a couple of suggestion in regards to the landscaping and the possible entry monument.

Mr. Rink asked if they were open to public art and asked what the true height of the garage was.

Mr. Bogan stated they are open to including the community. Brandon added that the parking structure was five stories not six.

A member of the ABR asked about the different types of material you plan to use with the project.

Mr. Bogan stated that the material choice at this time wasn't definite; however they are looking to use durable high quality materials, hard masonry materials along with metal paneling and other materials.

Ms. Hamley O'Donnell asked were there any other specific questions relating to the material use, and there were none. She went on to explain the guidelines in Planning and Development Overlay, which are standards for many different parts of the PDO District including, but not limited to, urban design and concepts, permitted uses, architectural design standards, maximum density, yard requirements, height regulations, transportation, pedestrian and bicycle friendly design circulation, landscaping, screening and lighting, accessibility, outdoor places and amenities, utilities, sustainability and phasing of the project. These Standards, once adopted, become the rezoning of the site. The guidelines will overlay the site, giving guidance during the

project development. The Development Plan will also require the approval of the Planning Commission and the design will go before the Architectural Board of Review. The Commission were all provided with a copy of these Standards in their packets. She added that if they have questions or comments, she'll be more than happy to answer.

Ms. Fliegel asked if there was some form of detail about the type of signage that will be allowed.

Mr. Wong stated the he agreed that there should be something in the Standards that stated the type of signs that are permitted in the area.

Ms. Hamley O'Donnell said she will make note of that and ensure that signage is placed within the guidelines. She asks Mr. Bogan if this was something they were accustomed to.

Mr. Bogan stated absolutely and that they are willing to work with the community and staff to ensure that they develop the best possible sign for the site. He asked if there was an issue with illuminated/ moving signage.

Ms. Fliegel stated that she has no issue with that particular sign; however she didn't want the sign to be overwhelming to resident and patrons in the community.

Mr. Bogan stated the design process is still the works for the signage and that they want the sign to fit with the community standards as well as be inviting. He stated that under the Architectural Design standard "E," with that he appreciates the design element and wants to break it down in way that work for all involved. He adds that he wanted to avoid overly outlandish design with the project. He wanted to keep with the community and the city itself.

Mr. Rink wanted clarification on the section 2 of the permitted land use. He asked was it correct that every unit is proposed as a rental and will there be ability in the future to purchase for individual sales.

Ms. Hamley O'Donnell stated that, from a land use standpoint, they look at multiple-family designation could be for sale or for rent. She went on to note specifics of the definition of multiple families per the city codes. She added that they have talked with the developer and encouraged them to design the project so that, in the future, rental properties could be adapted for sale for an individual.

Mr. Bogan confirmed that each unit will be listed an individual rental. He added that each apartment will be built to condominium standards and, if the market were to change, that they would be willing to work with the community. He added that they haven't seen any of their product go in that direction.

Jonathan Kurtz, ABR, asked was there a requirement relative to sidewalk widths. He went on to mention the Section "E" states that there's a 10 foot landscape buffer. He is concerned that landscape buffer would obstruct the view of the driveway. He asked if they were able to show the slide of the alleyway for better visual.

Mr. Bogan stated they want the sidewalks to be a minimum of 4 foot walkway, he adds that they want to ensure that everyone is comfortable while enjoying the site. From dining to shopping without obstruction, he reiterated the requirements listed in the guidelines for landscape and how they plan to adhere to them.

Ms. Hamley O'Donnell added that the landscape buffer was specifically to a parking lot adjacent to a residential use. She added that the City's code requires buffering between the parking lot and the Buckingham.

Mr. Wong added that they're on target with the proportions of the sidewalk width being for 4 feet in width to add to patron and resident comfort.

Ms. Cohen wanted to know would this pertain to the sidewalk on Cedar.

Mr. Bogan stated they would see those as stay consistent to what is currently in place, with 12 feet width to accommodate to the potential of on street dining.

Terry Saylor, ABR, asked where the public space stops and the resident living area begin.

Mr. Bogan stated the resident patio will not be cluttered with furniture due to how they're designed. They will only be able to hold minimal furniture.

Ms. Hamley O'Donnell stated that she liked adding specific sidewalk width requirements to the Standards. She stated that can be add to the guidelines and she will work on the material diffraction.

Ms. Fliegel asked about the glass tower element, knowing that it's residential. How are they planning on keep it private for residents and appealing for patrons.

Mr. Bogan stated the design in those units would add appeal. The resident would have rolling shades with a full glazed window.

Mr. Horowitz wanted to clarify the end cap at the base of Cedar and wanted to know was that going too addressed at any time. He adds that he understood that the landscaping was going to be needed to add appeal of the site.

Mr. Bogan clarified that Mr. Horowitz's concern was more that the site is facing Euclid Heights Boulevard, that the building forms an end and not a true point element.

Mr. Horowitz stated that the building looks as though the building faces each of the side streets but doesn't address the corner.

Mr. Bogan stated that is something they will study as they go along the final constructional design of the site.

Ms. Hamley O'Donnell asked if the Architectural Board of Review wanted to give any more feedback at this time.

One member stated that he believes that the developer is attempting to do what is necessary to appeal to all concerned with the design of the site. He stated they like the look of the current design and they feel that this will fit with the surrounding area's design.

Another ABR member stated that he was concerned with the design of the four-story Cedar Road façades which need more work. Overall he was pleased with the design.

Mr. Bogan stated that he is aware of the many opinions and concerns with the design and they are working hard to make the best decisions for the City, residents and the community, as well as with the Architectural Board of Review.

Ms. Cohen asked if the storefront design is going to be standard with the font of their individual signs or will each retailer be able to design their own storefront.

Mr. Bogan stated they have given flexibility, as well standard signage, to retailers in the past. He stated that they try to keep some continuity to the storefront design, but still allow flexibility.

Ms. Hamley O'Donnell added that the Architectural Board of Review will still oversee the process of signage within the site to ensure that they are within the City Codes and any PDO Development Standards.

Mr. Horowitz asked what the plan was to address traffic coming up on Cedar Hill towards Euclid Height Boulevard; the lights of cars will point in the direction of the residential living quarters.

Mr. Bogan stated that he hasn't yet done a study to properly answer that question. They will take a look at that.

A member of the ABR stated that coming up the hill, there is about a 30 foot sightline. He said that a lot of the light will point downward. He added that even if that was to occur, that those

front units are going to be very in-demand units. Having the ability to have the view of looking down the hill is what will be attractive to residents.

Mr. Mattox, Jr. stated that he likes the structure of the building; it would be a nice touch to add arches or possible art work to enhance the site.

A member of the ABR asked Mr. Bogan if there is a landscape designer working to develop site lighting protocols for this site, in terms of pedestrian lighting.


Mr. Bogan replied yes. They will be working on the lighting that cuts through the site, and develop all the protocols for that element. In terms of the lighting around Cedar and Euclid Heights Boulevard, he believes that they will need to work with community to have better understanding of what is needed.

Mr. Mattox, Jr. asked if they could explain the type of material that they will be using for the street other than asphalt.

Brandon Bogan stated that there are talks about using a type of textural material, either scored concrete, stamped asphalt or similar.

Ms. Hamley O'Donnell explained to the public that this was the first step in the Planned Development Overlay (PDO) District and added that on Friday, October 12, 2018, she will send out to the Planning Commission who will review the material and what has been added or changed. She added that at the next Planning Commission meeting is when they will vote to request Council adopt the PDO District. This will start the process of rezoning, along with other Council meetings and Planning Commission meetings, and at that point they will start a parallel path to meet with the Architectural Board of Review. Ms. Hamley O'Donnell added that there will be an additional public meeting, which will be held at the Community Center at 7:30 pm following this meeting. This is where the public will be able to give comments.

Mr. Cobb thanked the development team and staff for all their hard work and adjourned the meeting at 6:45 p.m.


Craig S. Cobb, Chair


Richard Wong, Secretary