

Monroe Planning Commission Minutes
September 20, 2016 – 6:00 pm
233 South Main Street, Monroe, Ohio

The Planning Commission of the City of Monroe met in regular session at 6:00 pm on September 20, 2016. The meeting was held at Monroe City Hall.

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm by Mr. Morris. Members present were Steve Wood and Ron Tubbs.

Also present were: Kevin Chesar, Director of Development/Zoning Enforcement Officer; and Kameryn Jones, Planner.

Mr. Wood moved to approve the minutes for August 16, 2016 meeting. Seconded by Mr. Tubbs. Voice vote. Motion carried.

Case No. 2016-8-18: Consideration of a site plan for Popeyes

Ms. Jones stated that Pat Gilligan with GOC Realco LLC has submitted a site plan application for a Popeyes restaurant and drive thru along State Route 63, adjacent to the recently approved Dunkin' Donuts site. The current Popeyes facility located in the Shell building will be transferred to this new standalone site, with plans for either a new fast food restaurant in its place or an expansion of the Shell convenience store. The Popeyes site will be located on approximately 0.89 acres. The proposed restaurant is a 3,149 square foot building that will include a drive thru lane. The applicant anticipates a September start date and finishing up in April of 2017.

Ms. Jones stated that surrounding zoning includes to the North: C-1 Commercial (Vacant property), South: C-1 Commercial (Eating and drinking establishments), West: C-1 Commercial (Vacant property), and to the East: C-1 Commercial (new Dunkin Donuts site).

Ms. Jones stated that sidewalks are required along State Route 63 with a sidewalk connection from SR63 to the establishment. Within the site, entrance sidewalks must be 8 ft wide at a minimum; the main entrance appears to meet Code; the western side entrance sidewalk at 6.76' does not. Though this entrance may not be intended for customer use, it should be noted with the angled parking stalls on the same western side, this may eventually function as a frequently used customer entrance.

Ms. Jones stated that street trees are required along the SR63 frontage with a minimum of two inches DBH. However, street trees may not be possible at this location. Front yard trees have been provided as part of the required front yard landscaping. Five trees are required, 7 canopy trees proposed along front yard (out of ROW). Perimeter parking requires one canopy tree for every 5 parking spaces with a 3 foot visual screen of shrubs, 6 canopy trees required. The applicant has proposed 7 canopy trees not including those proposed in the front yard area.

Ms. Jones stated the 3 ft screen of bushes is not entirely met on the eastern side of the site or parts of the western edge. Additionally, the western parking landscaping is not located adjacent to the parking lot, which may be due in part to the location of a water line running north/south in the vicinity. The landscaping is provided but, not located in the typical location and should be discussed further. Additionally, the proposed planting may not meet minimum height requirement. The Fastigiata tree type may not meet 40' height requirement but, due to its location in a confined area, the proposed tree type is appropriate. The southern outside landscape island does not indicate the required canopy trees or that 20% of the required front yard area must be landscaped. As the front yard setback for C-1 sites is 50 ft, the minimum depth of landscaping of front yard is 10 feet. The Applicant meets this requirement with an 18 ft setback of landscaping along State Route 63.

Ms. Jones stated in regards to building architecture the base-body-cap design standards require a minimum of 8% wall height to be made of the base, 60% body, and 8% cap. The percentages shown meet this standard. Building elevations visible from a public street should contain windows that make up 25% of the wall area which would include all but the rear (north). It does not appear that any of the elevations meet this requirement. Parapet walls with three-dimensional cornice treatments are required for flat roof structures. The cornice is required to be a minimum 8" perpendicular project. The applicant should provide more detail on the proposed parapet.

Ms. Jones stated that Fire has no comment at this time but reserves the right to comment during plans review. The Public Works Department and Police Department has no comment at this time.

Ms. Jones states that staff recommends approval of the site based on the following conditions: Side entrance sidewalk is extended to meet the 8' width minimum. Street sidewalk to be installed by the City at the property owner's expense at a future date. Discussion of whether the shutters should be included or not included as part of the required window area percentage. Clarification of the parapet dimensions. While the applicant has indicated that a dumpster is intended to be shared with the adjacent Dunkin Donuts site as they will be under common ownership, if the sites are ever to be split or sold off, a separate dumpster may be required with the associated pavement. The western parking landscaping location (not adjacent to the parking lot) be further discussed by Planning Commission. All other staff comments are addressed.

Mr. Wood suggests a sidewalk across from the exit door to Dunkin Donuts to the Popeyes location near the handicap parking stalls. This would eliminate foot traffic through the landscape median and possibly eliminate trip hazards.

Mr. Gilligan stated that he agreed with Mr. Wood suggestion and concern.

Mr. Wood stated that when the future sidewalk is installed that the current landscape and street trees would have to be removed in order to accommodate a sidewalk. Mr. Wood suggests eliminating the street trees and only placing shrubs in a staggered pattern in this location in order to accommodate the future sidewalk.

Mr. Gilligan suggested submitting a new landscape plan for both the Popeyes and Dunkin Donuts site showing the sidewalk installed to see what landscaping should be installed now to accommodate a future 5 foot sidewalk.

Mr. Chesar stated that if the street trees are waived, that a street tree waiver fee may still apply, but would work with the applicant in those regards.

Mr. Morris voiced concern on the shared dumpster area with Dunkin Donuts.

Mr. Chesar stated he would like to see where an additional dumpster would be located if the one of the two properties were ever sold in the future. He also expressed concern for any garbage that would be set outside for any length of time prior to being rolled out to the back of the property to the dumpster area.

Mr. Gilligan stated that an area exists for an additional dumpster and would submit an updated plan showing that and screening at the rear of the building to block any trash that would be staged prior to being taken to the dumpster.

Mr. Chesar stated that he would like Planning Commissions thoughts on using shutters to break up the wall mass coverage on the building.

Mr. Gilligan stated that the area the large shutters are located would be the kitchen area. If the awnings are included in the calculations they actually meet code on all sides except for one.

Mr. Morris stated that he did not see any problem with the current plan, but would like to see an addition of a third shutter on the west side of the structure.

Mr. Tubbs moved to approved Case 2016-8-18 Consideration of a site plan for Popeyes with the following conditions: waiver to sidewalk requirements at this time, but acknowledge that when connectivity takes place that the applicant will be required to install sidewalk connectivity per code and at the applicants cost, Waiver to the 8 foot sidewalk on the east side, addition of a third shutter on the west side of the structure, front landscaping to be modified based on staff approval and all other staff comments are met. Seconded by Mr. Wood. Voice vote. Motion carried.

Mr. Morris stated that the Zoning Code in reference to residential accessory structures list various material types except for metal. He states that within the city he has found metal structure garages that are holding up well and match the façade of the houses. With today's metal products this is now an acceptable option.

Mr. Morris moved to amend the Zoning Code to accept un-corrugated metal as an acceptable material for an accessory structure in residential areas and to require impervious flooring to these structures. Seconded by Mr. Tubbs. Voice vote. Motion carried.

Mr. Tubbs inquired as to whether residential zoning would have to be changed to agricultural if chickens were permitted in residential areas.

Mr. Chesar stated that the zoning for residential would not be changed but the raising of chickens would be added as an accessory use within the residential zoning areas with the recommendations that are agreed upon by Planning Commission and approved or modified by Council.

Mr. Wood stated that he would like to make the stipulation that chickens should remain in an enclosure so to not be able to roam freely.

Mr. Morris asked for clarification as to why a utility trailer or enclosed trailer is listed as a recreational vehicle and falls under the guidelines for recreational vehicles. Utility trailers are typically used for business/home occupation services not recreation.

Mr. Chesar stated that in order to run a business out of your home, the business and any materials that are used for the business must be held within the perimeters of the dwelling. Any items, supplies, or equipment for that business cannot be stored outside.

Mr. Chesar stated that he would look into different options for cases involving utility trailers and home business's for Planning Commission to discuss at a later date.

Mr. Wood moved to adjourn at 7:28 pm. Seconded by Mr. Tubbs. Voice vote. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted by:

Deana England
Executive Assistant/Deputy Clerk of Council