

**KENT PLANNING COMMISSION
BUSINESS MEETING
OCTOBER 20, 2020**

MEMBERS PRESENT: **Amanda Edwards
Chris Clevenger-Morris
Peter Paino
Michael Bruder
Jeff Clapper**

STAFF PRESENT: **Eric Fink, Asst. Law Director
Bridget Susel, Community Development Director
Jennifer Barone, Development Planner**

I. Call to Order

Ms. Edwards called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

II. Roll Call:

Ms. Edwards, Mr. Morris, Mr. Paino, Mr. Clapper, and Mr. Bruder were present.

III. Reading of the Preamble

Ms. Edwards read the Preamble, which describes the purpose and procedures of the Planning Commission as well as the applicant's right to an appeal.

IV. Administration of Oath

Mr. Fink instructed those members of the audience wishing to be heard on any of the cases presented at this meeting to rise and raise their right hand. Mr. Fink administered the Oath, "Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony that you are about to give this evening is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? Please say "I do." The participants responded, "I do."

V. Correspondence

- PC20-015: Bruce Bailey – email regarding storm water concerns; opposed to the Conditional Zoning Certificate.

VI. Old Business

None

VII. New Business

- A. PC20-001 Klaben Ford Proposed Site Plan
 1035 West Main Street
 Conditional Zoning Certificate and Site Plan Review**

The applicants are seeking a Conditional Zoning Certificate and Site Plan Review & Approval to reconfigure the parking lot. The subject property is zoned IC-R: Intensive Commercial – Residential zoning district.

Ms. Edwards stated that the applicant has asked to be continued until the November 17, 2020 meeting.

**B. PC20-015 Kent Social Services Building Expansion and Renovation
1066 South Water Street
Conditional Zoning Certificate and Site Plan Review**

The applicants are seeking a Conditional Zoning Certificate and Site Plan Review & Approval to renovate and expand the building. The subject property is zoned R-C: High Density Multifamily - Commercial zoning district.

[Mr. Bruder did not participate in this case due to his involvement with the project.]

Ms. Barone reviewed the staff report. She explained that they are proposing two additions; one of the SW corner to provide a pantry space and administrative offices, and one on the east side to expand and update the dining room. She added that there will also be exterior renovations that include a new entrance and outdoor seating area. Ms. Barone stated that the required conditions for the conditional use from Section 1171 are listed in the staff report. She stated that staff feels that all of the listed conditions have been met. Ms. Barone stated that they will also be modifying their parking area; removing pavement for a grass area and install a PARTA bus stop. She stated that they are required to provide 24 parking spaces and are instead providing 38. She stated that they will be adding a storm water infiltration system in the rear of the property, which meets the city's code. She stated that they have landscape plan and a screened dumpster area in the SW corner of the property. She added that the Architectural Review Board reviewed the project and recommended approval of the project as presented.

Luke Kraft, DS Architecture, 315 Gougler Ave., reviewed the project. He stated that the pantry area will serve most of the people and needs its own dedicated entrance and process for that function. Mr. Kraft explained the floor plan, site plan, and exterior changes. He stated that Artman Engineering worked with the city staff to develop an approved storm water plan to handle all of the storm water on site. He added that the sign will be handled under a separate project. Mr. Kraft stated that the exterior of the building will receive a big face lift.

Mr. Paino questioned why they are providing more parking spaces than what is required.

Mr. Kraft stated that it was based on the patrons that they currently serve now.

Mr. Paino questioned the trees that are being removed.

Mr. Kraft stated that many of the trees that they are removing are 12 inches in diameter but they are trying to keep the trees that are larger than 12 inches.

Mr. Paino questioned if the retention area is needed due to the increase in parking spaces.

Mr. Kraft stated that they are reducing the amount of impervious pavement that is currently on site as an attempt to reduce the amount of storm water; the amount of parking has been reduced from the current amount.

Mr. Paino questioned if they are adding any site lighting.

Mr. Kraft stated that the existing lighting is to remain.

Ms. Barone stated that the code does not require parking lot lighting.

Mr. Paino questioned if new trees will need to be planted.

Ms. Edwards stated that page AS1.00 shows where the new trees will be planted. Ms. Edwards questioned the bike rack requirement.

Ms. Barone stated that they are not required for this project.

Mr. Clapper questioned the bus stop.

Mr. Kraft stated that he doesn't know the background of why the bus stop isn't located on South Water Street but it is being constructed to accommodate their patrons.

Public Comment

None

Planning Commission Discussion

Mr. Clapper stated that the project will be a huge improvement for South Water Street. He stated that he does have some concerns regarding the landscaping interfering with the line of site for traffic.

Ms. Barone stated that this can be reviewed and adjusted if need be in technical plan review.

Mr. Morris stated that he has similar concerns regarding traffic safety. He added that he also questions the location of the bus stop but also understands utilizing the available space. He stated that as long as these items are addressed in technical plan review, he doesn't have any other issues.

Ms. Susel stated that the bus stop would have been approved by PARTA after an evaluation to determine the best location for an additional stop.

Mr. Kraft confirmed that this was reviewed by the PARTA design staff and board.

Mr. Paino stated that he feels that the building looks great, and he has already had all of his questions answered.

Ms. Edwards stated that the building looks phenomenal, is well thought out and will be beneficial to the community. She stated that it would be nice to have a bicycle rack installed. She stated that she is concerned about the upkeep of the community garden and what it may look like in the winter time. She stated that she thinks that the site plan is fantastic.

MOTION: *Mr. Clapper moved that in Case PC20-015, Family and Community Services, 1066 South Water Street, the Planning Commission approve the Conditional Zoning Certificate and Site plan to renovate and expand the building subject to the following:*

1. Technical Plan Review

The motion was seconded by Mr. Morris.

The motion carried 4-0-1. Mr. Bruder abstained.

C. Zoning Code Update: Work Session Ten

The proposed Zoning Code Text Amendment is being forwarded to the Commission for review and comment.

- **Proposed Chapter 1112: Administrative Organization**
- **Proposed Chapter 1105: Supplemental Zoning District Standards and Overlay Zoning Districts**

Ms. Barone explained which sections staff is looking for comments on.

Ms. Morris stated that he doesn't have any issues with the subdivision section and added that he appreciates the changes in the three sections outside of that.

Ms. Susel stated that they will pass along the edits to Section 1112 to the consultant to be included into the draft.

Chapter 1105 Supplemental Standards and Overlay Zoning District

There was discussion of possible new overlay districts in the future and how those would be developed and whether or not they would be under the Architectural Review Board's purview.

Mr. Morris questioned the colors on the maps to ensure that they are compatible with color blindness.

Ms. Susel stated that they can remove the colors for this map as they are not important; only the outline of the overlay district.

Ms. Barone stated that they will check the other maps for compatibility.

Ms. Susel stated that they can also increase the size of the map.

Mr. Paino questioned the boundaries.

Ms. Susel stated they are not altering the current map, however, this map is incorrect and will be corrected.

Mr. Bruder questioned how the boundaries are set and by whom.

Ms. Susel stated that proposed changes would be subject to Planning Commission recommendation to Council but there are also many stakeholders that have had communications regarding the overlay district. She stated that at this time there will not be any changes to the map that is currently in effect. She stated that it will be reviewed at a future date. She referred to Section E: Amendments, Additional Districts.

Mr. Bruder questioned the residential residences in this district.

Ms. Susel explained that if a residential structure is not going for plan review, it would not be subject to a certificate of appropriateness and review by the ARB. She referred to Section 1112.04(B)(1)(c): Residential Exception.

Section 1105.02

Ms. Barone stated that the Preservation Alternate used to be its own separate section has now been placed in the Overlay Section. She explained that the R-3 and R-4 districts have been included and the minimum acreage has been reduced to 2.

Ms. Susel stated that the reduction gives an opportunity to use this option on a smaller parcel. She stated that there aren't many large parcels available in the city currently. She added that a variance could be sought for parcels smaller than 2 acres. Ms. Susel stated that they have also eliminated a lot of criteria that staff felt was very difficult to meet.

Mr. Paino stated that he likes the idea. Mr. Paino questioned why Sections 7 and 8 were removed on page.

Ms. Barone stated that the minimum right of way in the city is 60'.

Mr. Paino stated that he feels that the right of way street width can be somewhat onerous and cumbersome and should be debatable. He stated that this cuts down existing trees and creates a wide swath of land that is not necessary. Mr. Paino questioned why each dwelling unit must be within 250' but not less than 40' of a public street was removed.

Mr. Fink stated that they wanted to give the architect more freedom as it removes the regulations that controls how long or short a driveway could be; the Planning Commission will review and approve.

Mr. Paino questioned the clarity of the changes.

Ms. Susel stated that it is not an overlay district and suggested changing the title of the chapter.

Mr. Fink stated that he will look at this again. He explained that zoning is about restrictions and this is eliminating many of the restrictions that they currently have.

Ms. Susel suggested the title Supplemental Zoning Districts and Overlay Zoning Districts.

VII. Minutes

MOTION: Mr. Morris moved to approve the September 15, 2020 Planning Commission minutes as revised. Mr. Paino seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-0-1. Mr. Clapper abstained.

IX. Adjournment

MOTION: Mr. Bruder moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Mr. Paino. The motion carried 5 – 0. The meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.