

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Meeting

COPLEY TOWNSHIP ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC., FORM NO. 10145

Held

February 5, 2018

20

Ms. McPherson convened the Architectural Review Board meeting at 6:04 p.m. Present were Dwayne Groll, Rodney Kovacs, Kelly McPherson, Dale Couch and Joe Gregory. Melanie Friedman and Christine Davis were absent. Also present were Matt Springer and Shawna Gfroerer from the Department of Community & Economic Development.

Kelly McPherson served as Chair in absence of Melanie Friedman.

The election of officers for 2018 was brought forward for consideration by Mr. Springer. After continued discussion and recommendation by Mr. Springer, the Board members present decided to postpone the election of officers so that additional Board members could be present.

The minutes from the December 4, 2017 meeting were tabled so that additional Board members could be present to review.

Mr. Groll moved to approve the minutes submitted for the November 6, 2017 meeting, Mr. Couch, second. Mrs. Friedman called for the vote. The motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS

APPLICANT: James M. Parker
LANDOWNER: James M. Parker
LOCATION: 4060 Copley Road, Copley, OH 44321
ZONING DISTRICT: R-MD
PROPOSAL: Permit location to be used as an Event Center

Mr. Springer presented the application of James & Norma Parker for the proposed Event Center at the Parker Farm. Mr. Springer stated that the farm is located within the Residential-Low Density Zoning District and this would be Copley's first Event Center within the community. Mr. Springer reviewed the February 16, 2017 text amendment adoption by the Board of Trustees permitting the Township to approve event centers as a Conditional Use. Mr. Springer indicated that the goal is to regulate and formalize properties in the township which currently host social events and serve as event centers without formal approval. Mr. Springer stated that the Conditional Use does not allow event centers in commercial districts and the current Conditional Use would be utilized to enhance economic opportunities to properties in the Township with a CAUV (Current Agricultural Use Value) in place. Mr. Springer stated that as an event center they must comply with regulations regarding parking, type of event and size of event based on acreage. The Parkers would be permitted to host large events of no more than 300 persons. Mr. Springer stated that the Parker's have satisfied all of the regulations set forth in the text amendment including a minimum 200' setback, 50' parking setback, agreement to host no more than forty (40) events per calendar year, adhere to noise specifications, provide Notice to Property Owners of their event calendar annually, and maintain specified hours of operation, Friday-Saturday-10 am-11 pm and Sunday-Thursday-10 am-8 pm

Mr. Springer presented further discussion on the restriction of event centers from commercial properties. The goal is to promote agriculture viability in the Township by requiring that a CAUV must be in place. The Parkers have a CAUV for this property. This helps to differentiate the commercially zoned party center. Mr. Springer stated that the type of Event Center promoted through the text amendment would be to encourage event centers in the Township similar to those you find in national parks. Mr. Springer displayed photos in his presentation which represent events which have taken place at the Parker Farm Barn and the Wolf Creek Trading Company Barn. These events have not been regulated and this was brought to the attention of the Township approximately 1 1/2 years ago.

Mr. Springer reviewed the applicant's request to host events with or without catering, with or without music and stated the Event Center would attract business including corporate functions and social functions.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Meeting

COPLEY TOWNSHIP ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC., FORM NO. 10148

Held

February 3, 2018

20

1 Mr. Springer stated that narrative of use & impact given on the application showed that the
2 proposed use would be centered inside of the primary parcel acreage. The proposed use
3 would also include three (3) entry/exit locations and consistent with Copley regulations.

4
5 Mr. Springer indicated that after the review of ingress & egress points along Copley Road,
6 only two points would be utilized by the public with the third point available to safety
7 response only, and not utilized for public access or parking.

8
9 Mr. Springer reported that the Parker's have met all standards put forward. The applicant
10 and landowner were not present as they are out of state. Trustee Bruce Koellner is standing
11 in as their neighbor.

12
13 Mr. Springer stated on behalf of James and Norma Parker that the barn was originally
14 constructed for agriculture use. Several years ago, Norma Parker utilized the barn for a family
15 member's wedding. The barn has become a Class A facility used for family and friends. The
16 goal is to open up the use of the barn as a comfortable, legally standing entity available for
17 public use.

18
19 Mr. Springer recommended approval to the ARB to move forward to the BZA.

20
21 Ms. McPherson opened the floor for questions.

22
23 Ms. McPherson asked for more information about the reference to the Wolf Creek Trading
24 Company Barn. Mr. Springer stated the Wolf Creek Barn is different from the Parker Barn
25 from a zoning classification standpoint (commercial vs. residential) and was not currently up
26 for consideration at this time.

27
28 Mr. Gregory asked if the Code requires event centers to have the CAUV and does everything
29 in the Parker's application meet the code and embody the code? Mr. Springer responded that
30 yes, this was part of the rationale for the text amendment.

31
32 Ms. McPherson inquired about the regulations on the property for preservation for the future.
33 Mr. Springer stated that to his knowledge there are no additional land disturbance plans
34 under consideration at this time.

35
36 Ms. McPherson asked about the potential of other event centers who want to build a barn and
37 require clearing in residential. Mr. Springer stated that as long as they are not disturbing
38 more than ten (10) acres it may be a possibility. However, proposed projects in the future
39 would remain subject to the review and approval by the Township and the applicable boards.

40
41 Mr. Gregory inquired about the requirements for the CAUV and size stipulations. Mr. Springer
42 stated he was not fully aware, but there are standards pertaining to income associated with
43 the agricultural use and how the land is being used.

44
45 Ms. McPherson asked if the Township is using an established CAUV as a governing body to
46 approve for Copley Township. Mr. Springer stated that the use of the CAUV helps ensure the
47 land is protected and not split up by parcels to sell off and develop. This allows the landowner
48 to preserve the land and also produce an income not dependent on agriculture. The main
49 incentive is to not develop the land. This is one of the goals repeatedly identified within the
50 Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

51
52 Ms. McPherson asked if the Township has promoted this opportunity to other property
53 owners with over ten (10) acres. Mr. Springer stated that the Township does the best they
54 can to communicate standards through public meetings and notifications.

55
56 Mr. Groll requested remarks from Bruce Koellner regarding information as a neighboring
57 land owner. Mr. Koellner opened by stating he agrees that the Township needs to promote
58 the fact that this is an option for other landowners. He stated that there are standards they
59 need to adhere to, but there are also exemptions for farmland in regards to fire, and other
60 items. Mr. Koellner stated that if there is a way to subsidize farming interest to hold off
61 commercial development of land this would be a great benefit.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Meeting

COPLEY TOWNSHIP ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC., FORM NO. 10148

Held February 5, 2018 20

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Mr. Springer stated that the Township has used both Facebook and Twitter to communicate discussions regarding the first Event Center in Copley.

Mr. Koellner stated that he is a proponent for safety conscience event centers which do not pose a threat. He stated this opportunity would be good for economic development in the Township and for the property owners.

Mr. Groll asked Mr. Koellner how his experience has been as a neighbor based on other events. Mr. Koellner stated there have been no real issues, the Parkers have been great neighbors and although slight noise may be heard it has not been a disturbance.

Mr. McPherson asked Mr. Koellner about traffic issues in the neighboring area surrounding the events. Mr. Koellner stated he was not aware of any traffic issues.

Mr. Gregory asked if Zoning is approved, how long does this Conditional Use apply. Mr. Springer stated that as long as they comply with standards and the CAUV for use, they would have access to the permit.

Mr. Gregory asked if the Conditional Use would change if they sell off acres. Mr. Springer stated that they would need to still meet the setback standards.

Mr. Gregory asked if the Conditional Use still applies to the land overall and adjusted based on the new size. Mr. Springer stated that as long as they are in complete compliance, they would not need to come back to the Board. If setbacks are not met as a result, they would need to come back to the board for further approval.

Ms. McPherson asked if there is sufficient parking. Mr. Springer stated that yes, they have a field dedicated to parking, a spill over field and side parking if needed.

Mr. Springer stated that overall, Township staff is recommending approval. He stated that the request is a good use to maintain preservation, fulfil some goals from the Land Use Plan, help Copley become a unique destination, and help to support surrounding businesses.

Ms. McPherson asked what Conditional Use means in this case. Mr. Springer stated that this would be treated the same as a Conditional Use for any other application including church and educational facilities meaning there is not a re-valuation in the future as long as they remain in compliance.

Mr. Gregory asked if neighbors were notified of this request. Mr. Springer stated that yes, they were notified via letter and that a few have raised valid concerns and he has recently spoken to a homeowner and highlighted the benefits of safeguarding this property from potential commercial development.

Ms. McPherson asked if the site is over parked are they planning to use paved and non-agricultural surfaces. Mr. Springer state that changes like this would constitute coming back to the board and that they must adhere to Article 9 of Zoning Resolution regarding parking.

Mr. Groll asked to elaborate on the concerns raised. Matt Springer stated that there have been questions regarding noise, traffic, and lights. He stated he relayed that these events have been ongoing and there have been no known issues.

Mr. Gregory asked about noise specifications. Matt Springer stated that the noise ordinance would mirror the ordinance for Summit County.

Mr. Kovacs asked how the Township arrived at forty (40) events per year. Mr. Springer stated this was a result of evaluating other community standards. Mr. Springer stated that the code indicates no more than forty (40) events per year and gives the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) the authority to reduce this number if needed.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Meeting

COPLEY TOWNSHIP ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

DARTON LEGAL BLANK, INC., FORM NO. 10148

Held

February 7, 2018

20

- 1 Mrs. McPherson asked if there were any further comments from the public. None were
- 2 offered.
- 3
- 4 **Mr. Gregory moved to recommend approval to the Board of Zoning Appeals as**
- 5 **presented, Mr. Groll second. Ms. McPherson called for a vote. The motion carried.**
- 6
- 7

Board Member	Present	Motion	Second	Yea	Nay	Abstain
Melanie Friedman						
Kelly McPherson	X			X		
Joe Gregory	X	X		X		
Dwayne Groll	X		X	X		
Christine Davis						
Dale Couch (alt.)	X			X		
Rodney Kovacs (alt.)	X			X		

- 8
- 9 **APPLICANT: Mark Smith**
- 10 **LANDOWNER: JMD International, L.L.C.**
- 11 **LOCATION: 120 Montrose West Avenue, Parcels 17-02023 and 17-00458**
- 12 **BUSINESS: Candlewood Suites**
- 13 **ZONING DISTRICT: PDD**
- 14 **PROPOSAL: Demolish three (3) existing Hawthorne Extended Stay Suites and replace with**
- 15 **a high-end, 3 story Candlewood Suites Hotel**
- 16
- 17 Mr. Springer presented the next application on behalf of, Mark Smith, Architect and JMD
- 18 International for the proposal of a new Candlewood Suites on Montrose West Ave. Currently
- 19 a Hawthorne suites sits on the property. The plan is to demolish three (3) units on the south
- 20 side of property and replace with a 14,000 sq. ft. Candlewood Suites. A replat would be
- 21 required along with recording an unobstructed access easement for means of ingress/egress
- 22 and the shared use of common parking between the two different hotels. If approved and
- 23 built, the Extended Stay and Candlewood Suites would share the same access drive, some
- 24 shared parking, and a small amount of parking added along the western portion of the
- 25 property. This is a preliminary review to determine how comfortable the Board would be
- 26 with the proposed project. The proposal includes approximately seventy-five (75) rooms and
- 27 would be constructed with three (3) stories. The department is also meeting with Fire to
- 28 review. Mr. Springer gave an overview of the Candlewood Suites preliminary plot map. He
- 29 stated that based on recommendation from Fire, the Township would like to see the addition
- 30 of a green permeable emergency access along front of building and a 5' sidewalk installed
- 31 around perimeter of complex.
- 32
- 33 Mr. Gregory asked if there is an access easement agreement in place between the two
- 34 businesses. Mr. Springer stated that an unobstructed access easement is not currently
- 35 recorded.
- 36
- 37 Ms. McPherson inquired about a grade change on the property. Mr. Springer stated that Mark
- 38 Smith can speak to this detail.
- 39
- 40 Mr. Springer recommended that based on the current information, the Board continue the
- 41 approval until next month so the applicant can prepare additional documents. He stated that
- 42 the Montrose area has many hotel developments and some with unfavorable conditions. His
- 43 goal is to attract and retain new properties with more favorable conditions and status for the
- 44 community.
- 45
- 46 Ms. McPherson asked the applicant to state his name and address. Mr. Smith responded "Mark
- 47 Smith with an office location at 641 W Market Highland Square".
- 48

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Meeting

COPLEY TOWNSHIP ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC., FORM NO. 10148

Held

February 5, 2018

20

1 Mr. Smith stated that his primary questions for the Board are in regards to parking count
2 requirement. He believes they are approximately seventeen (17) spaces short for the entire
3 site. Mr. Smith said they have (ten) 10 spaces for each building of eight (8) units plus a couple
4 for administration with a current total of eighty-two (82) available spaces and with seventy-
5 five (75) rooms on new hotel, they would be short. He stated they may need to apply for a
6 variance for parking and if doing so, are they required to express a hardship or how should
7 they request the variance.

8
9 Ms. McPherson stated that it is hard to determine a hardship if there is not a full plan in place
10 yet.

11
12 Ms. McPherson asked if the new proposed hotel would have its own parcel. Mr. Smith stated
13 that yes, they would separate the parcel.

14
15 Mr. Groll asked if they same owner would own both parcels. Mr. Smith stated that yes, this is
16 the plan.

17
18 Ms. McPherson inquired about the grade change from the new building and the one to the
19 south. Mr. Smith stated that yes, there is a change which may require a retaining wall of
20 possibly 3' which would be installed along the southern property boundary.

21
22 Mr. Groll asked if they would still be short on parking if they paved the vacant lot open from
23 the unit which burned down several years ago.

24
25 Mr. Springer determined 143 spaces would be required with 135 existing and that the
26 Uniform Design Criteria (UDC) requires 1 space per room/unit.

27
28 Mr. Gregory asked if the existing space has been challenged for parking. Mr. Smith stated no
29 challenges to date, but they hope to increase business with the new proposed hotel.

30
31 Mr. Groll asked what happens when you have 100% occupancy.

32
33 Mr. Gregory stated that the demographic of an extended stay tends to be construction or
34 business with larger vehicles and asked if this was considered.

35
36 Mr. Springer stated that there is potential for additional parking, but did not want to disturb
37 the current green space.

38
39 Ms. McPherson inquired about double-load parking options and current setbacks for the
40 space. Mr. Springer stated that in the UDC, setbacks are dependent upon façade structures.

41
42 Ms. McPherson asked if the proposed number of rooms is a standard number for the design.
43 Mr. Smith said yes.

44
45 Mr. Springer inquired about the entrance location and could this be changed to give more
46 space. Mr. Smith said they haven't evaluated that to date but the lower floor plan would
47 potentially allow for a change in the entrance location to be more centralized to the parking
48 spaces.

49
50 Ms. McPherson asked if they could you add more parking to the front of building to the east.
51 Mr. Couch was concerned that this would cut down the turn radius available for safety
52 services.

53
54 Mr. Gregory inquired about an entrance relocation to the North. Mr. Smith said that was not
55 possible due to numerous differences in elevation.

56
57 Mr. Groll stated he would still consider allocation of parking to the vacant site.

58
59 Ms. McPherson asked if parking considerations have been made for service vehicles &
60 delivery trucks. Mr. Smith stated that the current set up would be utilized.

61

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Meeting

COPLEY TOWNSHIP ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC., FORM NO. 10148

Held

February 5, 2018

20

- 1 Ms. McPherson asked how staff would you like the ARB to proceed.
2
- 3 Mr. Groll stated that the parking issue would require BZA involvement.
4
- 5 Mr. Springer asked that we have the applicant provide alternatives for parking to preserve
6 green space. He thought the ARB may wish to see additional green space.
7
- 8 Mr. Groll asked if there are there any long term agreements to procure an adjacent parcel to
9 share parking when they are at capacity. Mr. Springer said that the companion uses in the
10 Zoning Resolution Code are designed between businesses such as hotels and restaurants. Mr.
11 Springer said hotel to hotel is not addressed, but could be entertained.
12
- 13 Mr. McPherson asked if they could loop the single load parking to the south. Mr. Smith said
14 this posed potential grade issues and would be difficult.
15
- 16 Mr. Gregory asked if there is consideration to move parcel lines to account for additional
17 parking sites. Mr. Smith stated they are considering a shared access easement to help alleviate
18 the situation.
19
- 20 Mr. Groll recommended Mr. Smith explore further agreements for options, including the
21 vacant burned out space for parking and exact parking count.
22
- 23 Mr. Groll asked if they would be submitting a sign package for consideration. Mr. Smith said
24 he did not anticipate a high-rise pole sign but rather just walls signs.
25
- 26 Ms. McPherson recommended at minimum a wayfinding sign at the entrance and review of
27 the high rise pole sign.
28
- 29 Ms. McPherson asked if the landscaping requirements could be met with such a tight site.
30 Mr. Smith determined that based on current code that landscape would be to screen parking
31 and this is already met. Mr. Smith asked if they would need anything additional.
32
- 33 Ms. McPherson asked if they met the 75%. Mr. Springer stated he could work with the
34 applicant to determine the landscape required for proposed plan and islands required.
35
- 36 Ms. McPherson asked if the applicant was planning to meet with the Board of Zoning Appeals
37 (BZA) regarding parking similar to the ARB preliminary meeting.
38
- 39 Ms. McPherson asked Mr. Springer if the applicant is able to meet the landscape
40 requirements, does the ARB need to consider parking. Mr. Springer stated he would want
41 ARB recommendation regarding parking to the BZA as well.
42
- 43 Mr. Couch suggested the applicant come back with a more definitive idea for parking. Mr.
44 Smith said they would like to put the spaces in the vacant space available from the unit which
45 burned down several years ago. This would leave them one (1) space short
46
- 47 Ms. McPherson recommended a landscape plan, parking plan and signage plan prior to future
48 presentations.
49
- 50 Mr. Gregory recommended a plan which shows how the applicant plans to preserve land.
51
- 52 Mr. Gregory asked why the Township was recommending a 5' sidewalk. Mr. Groll stated there
53 was no egress on the North/South, only on the East/West. Mr. Couch asked why there was a
54 proposed sidewalk if you can't access those sides of the building. He stated this didn't make
55 sense. Mr. Springer said that yes, the idea is to preserve the green in lieu of sidewalk and he
56 would like to scratch the recommendation from the comments.
57
- 58 Ms. McPherson asked for an overview of the setbacks. Mr. Springer stated that in the Planned
59 Development District (PDD) setbacks are based on façade heights & minimum building
60 separations. All commercial buildings must be separated by a minimum of their façade

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Meeting

COPLEY TOWNSHIP ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC., FORM NO. 10148

Held

February 5, 2018

20

1 height. Additionally, a commercial building must be setback from the right-of-way by a
2 minimum of 25 feet or the height of the building façade.

3
4 Ms. McPherson asked if the proposed building could be moved forward. Mr. Smith stated that
5 the proposed space has been moved forward approximately 20'.

6
7 Ms. McPherson asked where parking was deficient. Mr. Smith stated it was for the new
8 proposed building.

9
10 Mr. Smith stated he would do an alternative showing parking spaces north using the vacant
11 lot where the fire took place.

12
13 Ms. McPherson asked if there are any foreseen storm water management issues. Mr. Groll
14 stated that was not the concern of this Board and they would defer to the Summit County
15 Engineers Office.

16
17 Mr. Gregory asked what may happen if they separate parcels and this is successful, but if the
18 property is sold and the new owners may not agree. Mr. Groll said the agreement runs with
19 the sale of the land.

20
21 Mr. Groll stated that the Board had provided feedback and options. Mr. Groll stated that given
22 what they know today, they would not recommend to BZA, however, if given additional
23 details, they may.

24
25 Ms. McPherson said her preference would be to require fewer spaces.

26
27 Mr. Smith asked for clarification regarding who would speak to Fire regarding the request for
28 a perimeter sidewalk. Mr. Springer said he would speak to them.

29
30 Mr. Smith asked if the Board would like to see a detailed list for external materials. Mr.
31 Springer said yes, they would like to see exterior samples such as siding colors, shingle
32 materials and so on.

33
34 Mr. Couch asked if there is a standard scheme for the building. Mr. Smith stated yes, they are
35 required to purchase this and they have not done so yet.

36
37 **BUSINESS FROM THE COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR**


38 Mr. Springer provided the Board with Township updates and activities. Such updates
39 included the following:

- 40 • The Zoning Commission continues their work on the Comprehensive Land Use Plan.
41 They are working on Chapter 2. The plan is a continuation of the current plan up for
42 review to cover 2019-2029.
- 43 • The Omni Continuum Care Facility project is moving forward on Heritage Center
44 Drive.
- 45 • Thank you for supporting the ribbon cutting. We honored Kelly for helping with the
46 architectural build out and Joe and Jackie Gregory for their contributed slab of white
47 oak.
- 48 • There has been 2.5 million in new improvements.

49
50 With no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at
51 7:44 p.m.

52
53 Approved By:

Submitted By:

54
55 
56 Ms. McPherson, Acting Chair
57 Architectural Review Board
58


Shawna Gfroerer
Community & Economic Development