Call to Order – Chairperson Pavlick called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

Pledge of Allegiance and Invocation

Roll Call: Deborah Covert, Curt Gallo, Jim Hillyer, Tom Horsfall, Ted Hurd, Jerome Pavlick, and Marty Richmond were present.

Also present: Mayor Glenn Broska, John Cieszkowski, Planning and Zoning Director; Paul Janis, Law Director; John Chapman, Assistant Law Director and Clerk Andrea Parma.

Disposition of Minutes: July 10th, 2018 Regular Meeting and August 14, 2018 Regular Meeting

There were no minutes ready but Mr. Pavlick was sure they would be ready for the next meeting.

Old Business–

Sign Review- Chapter 1159 –

9766 State Route 14 – Preferred Wireless (Sprint) – wall sign

Jeff Sagan, Ace Lighting Sales and Service, 1260 Moore Rd Avon Ohio 44011 stated his company was commission by Sign Vision to install the front façade Sprint sign in accordance with the code using #10 tech screws, on a raceway color coded to the brick, LED internally illuminated in white, trim caps in white and the swoosh would be marigold translucent film.

Mr. Cieszkowski just needed the illumination levels in nits.

Mr. Sagan said those were tunable LEDs used in all the signs so he could tune the illumination level to fit the code. He gave Mr. Cieszkowski a spec sheet for the LEDs [Exhibit A].

Mr. Cieszkowski asked he be put in touch with whoever would be in charge of that illumination.
Mr. Sagan agreed.

**Motion:** Mr. Horsfall
I hereby move on this 11th day of September, 2018, the Streetsboro Planning and Zoning Commission approve a Wall sign for Sprint, 9766 State Route 14, Parcel #35.033.00.00.007.010 per sign plan received 8-13-18. Subject to administrative review and approval of conditions attached hereto as noted in the Planning and Zoning Director’s memo dated 8-26-18. The applicant/owner must make the sign contractor aware to ensure that the Specification Plate is affixed to all proposed signs at the time of installation. No sign can be installed until a permit has been paid for and issued through the Building Department. Seconded by Mr. Hurd. Roll call: Yes – 7, No – 0. Motion carried.

**New Business –**

**Meadow View Phase 9** – final plat review

Kevin Hoffman with Polaris Engineering and Surveying, 34600 Chardon Road, Willoughby Hills, presented the next phase of Meadow View; Phase 9 with 31 lots in the northern half of the site where most of the development had been occurring. The developer [Mark Holz] could not be here this evening. The City had requested some fencing around the stormwater management basin, the developer understood where the City was coming from but was not totally on board with it. Mr. Hoffman had talked with Mr. Holz just before the meeting and was told to go with it for now and if they can work something out (maybe a compromise on the kind of fence) after the fact they would come back to Planning Commission to do that. Mr. Holz didn’t want to hold up construction and asked Mr. Hoffman to relay that to the Commission.

Mr. Cieszkowski said regarding the applicant’s statement, he had no problem working with the developer to come to a solution to the fencing issue. He had discussed it with other subdivisions in the City and was addressing it from an insurance of health, safety and welfare perspective and as the applicant mentioned he was sure they could come to an agreement with the developer on some sort of fencing to insure that in the areas where the detention pond was adjacent to proposed sublots his concern was the safety of those future residents. He recommended approval subject to the conditions noted in his August 30th memo.

Mr. Hurd asked about the fence they were talking about, did they have a general fence style and type that all developers put into the plans or was it by the style of the homes; was each one the same or were they different.

Mr. Cieszkowski would like to see uniformity throughout the subdivision so that would be the beginning of his conversation with the developer.
Mr. Hurd asked if there were other areas that the developer had fenced off or was this the only instance in the project.

Mr. Cieszkowski said there was one in Phase 8 which was the last phase the commission approved and he believed they had specified a similar 4ft decorative aluminum fence.

Mr. Horsfall asked if this phase was the one that tied into Maplewood Drive.

Mr. Pavlick answered that was Phase 7 and it was already open.

**Motion: Mr. Horsfall**
I hereby move on this 11th day of September, 2018, the Streetsboro Planning and Zoning Commission approve a Final Plat for Meadow View Subdivision Phase 9, 31 single family residential lots Zoning District R-2 Medium Density Urban Residential per site plan received 8-13-18. Subject to administrative review and approval of conditions attached hereto as noted in the Planning and Zoning Director’s memo dated 08-30-18. Seconded by Mr. Gallo.
Roll call: Yes – 7, No – 0. Motion carried.

**10247 State Route 43 - Elnikar** – minor subdivision review re: lot depth to width ratio [1181.05(f)]

Stanley Elnikar, 10247 and 10277 State Route 43 (adjoining lots) proposed selling part of his property on the new Jefferson Rd [Philipp Pkwy] to Steele Hill. To do so he would need to make three new lots; the first would be 32.68 acres which he was going to sell, the second was by his house that was 25 acres and the third would be 7, almost 8 acres in front on SR 43. He was told his proposed lots were non-conforming due to the depth to width ratio. His current two lots never met that ratio so should be grandfathered in.

Mr. Cieszkowski clarified the lots lose their grandfathered status once a change was proposed. He reminded the commission he very much disliked the term grandfathered.

Mr. Horsfall asked clarification of Mr. Cieszkowski’s memo which said the Planning Commission had the latitude to okay this.

Mr. Cieszkowski affirmed and pointed out he noted in the memo the specific section of the zoning code (Section 1181.05) which said ‘except as otherwise authorized by the Planning Commission no lot depth shall exceed 3 and ½ times lot width’ so the Commission has explicit authority to approve lot to depth ratio that exceed the 3 ½ to 1 ratio.

**Motion: Mr. Horsfall**
I hereby move on this 11th day of September, 2018, the Streetsboro Planning and Zoning Commission approve a Minor Subdivision for Stanley Elnikar, 10247 State Route 43, Parcel #s 35.004.00.00.002.000, 35.004.00.00.003.000, 35.005.00.00.007.001 and 35.005.00.00.008.000 Zoning Districts R-1 Low Density
Urban Residential and I-1 Industrial, Research, Office to allow one parcel (7.932 acres) to have a maximum lot depth of 1,775.87 feet and to allow a second parcel (25.173 acres) to have a maximum lot depth of 3,451.3 feet. Per site plan received 08-13-18. Seconded by Ms. Covert.
Roll call: Yes – 7, No – 0. Motion carried.

Discussion of Electronic Message Center Signs in the O-C, R-1 and R-2 Districts

Mr. Pavlick reported the Commission received this evening a draft copy of a new code section in an ordinance [Exhibit B].

Mr. Cieszkowski explained staff was approached by two members of Council about permitting electronic message centers (EMC) signs in the R-1, R-2 and O-C Districts with the primary intent to allow EMC signs for the school properties. They discussed the fact that when EMC signs were permitted in those districts they would also be permitted for other non-residential uses in those districts and he felt better about allowing this or moving forward or going through this exercise in those three districts. Most people who have been on this Commission for a period of time knows that we have talked through EMC sign regulations ad nauseam but when Council makes a request that the Commission look into something we are then charged with drafting regulations for the Planning Commission to consider. He asked Mr. Janis to be here this evening to answer any questions they might generally have but again the Commission had talked through most of these issues before. Most of the regulations that they see in terms of the limitations on changeable copies are in line with what was finally decided upon when we discussed this to be applied to other districts so the frequency of change being 10 seconds was in line with what the Commission had talked through before. 50% of the permitted sign area was allowed to be EMC. He added some EMC specific illumination requirements based upon input he received at various Planning and Zoning workshops. He had asked Mr. Janis to add verbiage on correction of mechanical defects – something that basically indicates, as we talked through before, if there is a mechanical issue with an EMC he added a provision that would require that the sign be turned off until the defect is fixed. The other thing he felt they should add was a transition duration basically requiring when the message changes there is no lapse in time between one message and another; its’ pretty instantaneous. We don’t want any scrolling, fading, bouncing from one message to another. We do have a prohibition on animation and he recommended that remain but the transition duration would be added protection. He said they would look to make some of these minor revisions and get it to the Commission included in the packet for the next meeting so they have it in advance of the meeting.

Mr. Gallo asked what about the content, message itself.

Mr. Cieszkowski answered we can’t regulate the content of the message so we instead look to place time, place, and manner regulations as opposed to regulating the content.

Mr. Horsfall asked if regulating it by having it turned off was covered by1159.27(3)(d) where it says “the plan of operation will include the identity and contact information for a
responsible person who has the authority and the ability to immediately correct any operational deficiencies and/or terminate operation of the sign.” He asked if that would cover it.

Mr. Cieszkowski thought what was just read could be the same as the correction of defect.

Mr. Hurd asked if approving the plans for these types of sign in these certain districts caused any ramifications throughout the City and other districts; when they see the signs in these areas and want them in their areas. Would being so selective in certain areas cause a problem down the road?

Mr. Cieszkowski said it could but there was no way for him to know.

Mr. Pavlick commented that was for anything we permit.

Mr. Cieszkowski felt more comfortable permitting it in these three districts than permitted it in the B and C-3 Districts. This was proposed for the R-1, R-2 which were the districts the schools were located in and the O-C would encompass the sign on the Square.

Mr. Richmond said this was absolutely a slippery slope. He remembered the discussion when they talked about making some new district that only had the City buildings, school buildings, churches, libraries etc. but that was not practical. They had always wanted to accommodate the schools so he applauded the effort. He asked if this was really just for the schools.

Mr. Cieszkowski answered there were other non-residential uses in those districts and in thinking about those other uses they had drafted this to apply to monument signs permitted to conforming non-residential uses only.

Mr. Richmond pointed out University Hospitals made a compelling request for EMC but we said no and the gas stations are probably in the B District as well which he remembers the Commission wanting to allow it for gas stations.

Mr. Cieszkowski clarified some of the other non-residential uses in those districts would be daycares and churches.

Mr. Richmond stated there would be churches in and out of these districts so there was a partial inequality there. He paid a lot of attention to this because we spent so much time talking about it. He drives through Kent, Jackson Township and North Canton on his way to work and sees all the digital signs. There is still a low digital sign to fixed sign ratio so it was not overwhelming and doesn’t look like Las Vegas despite the fact that it has been permitted for years and years. We want to accommodate the schools, this is a good way to do it so he’ll eventually vote yes but of course we know this will be a problem later and eventually we are going to have to go to this in the whole City and we are not going to be able to stop it.
Mr. Horsfall thought the limiter up until now was the cost of the signs.

Mr. Richmond agreed and added this would be an enforcement issue like crazy because not everyone will know the very strict guidelines that were put in place.

Mr. Hillyer said they would have to first come to the City to get the sign approved and that was when they would be informed of the codes.

Mr. Richmond said it would be the Student Council that was creating the graphics so this year’s Student Council would know but next year’s would not so they would have the twirly stuff because as the technology evolves the signs would be able to do anything and it would be an enforcement nightmare.

Mayor Broska informed the Commission they had a new zoning inspector that would be charged with enforcement.

Mr. Richmond said he was still going to vote for this but we all know where this is going.

Mr. Hillyer said they had to embrace technology and move forward. They can’t stall this, they had to allow this to move forward and adjust the codes and regulations as needed.

Mr. Horsfall read proposed code section 1159.27 that said there is no animation, nothing that bounces, spins, twists or otherwise.

Mr. Richmond affirmed that was what it says but of course the signs will [spins, twists, etc.].

Mr. Chapman stated it would be treated as any other non-conforming sign, if they don’t correct it we would take the corrective measures needed.

Mayor Broska asked if this could be equated to adult bookstores only being allowed in a certain district with parameters. Does allowing these signs in certain areas put us in a better position that prohibiting them completely?

Mr. Horsfall asked if the 50% of the sign face remaining as is.

Mr. Cieszkowski answered he was proposing a revision to that; “50% of the total permitted sign area.”

Mr. Horsfall liked that better. The other part of his question was what would the other half be used for; just black background?

Mr. Cieszkowski said they were permitted 40 sq.ft for a planter sign, 50% or 20 sq ft would be EMC, the rest would be a static on premise sign.
Mr. Horsfall thought it was unfair because everyone else gets to use the whole 40 sq ft. Obviously it was text only with blank space all around which cuts their sign face in half.

Mr. Cieszkowski clarified the EMC component of the sign face can only be 20 sq ft.

Mr. Pavlick said they could put the business name on half and the changeable copy on the other half.

Mr. Horsfall asked what if the business name was on the EMC.

Mr. Pavlick said that was their choice.

Mr. Cieszkowski clarified 50% of it would be a normal sign and 50% could be changeable copy.

There was discussion about signs in the area; examples were Emidio & Sons Party Center, Kent Roosevelt High School, proposed Streetsboro School signs.

Mr. Horsfall thought 50% was too small a sq. ft for an EMC sign area.

Mr. Cieszkowski mentioned that there was a lot of variation for percentage for the EMC and 50% was on the higher end.

Mr. Horsfall said it was not really an identification sign, so what was the use of the EMC sign.

Mr. Cieszkowski answered the static 50% was the identification and the other 50% was highlighting whatever events were going on at the school, i.e. metal winners etc.

Mr. Hillyer thought this was a guiding principle, using the 50% as the baseline because they have to start somewhere and could adjust accordingly.

Mr. Pavlick said the Commission should read through this draft, Mr. Cieszkowski would get them the revisions to look at before the next meeting but this would be a basis to start with.

**Reports, Communications and Correspondence**

Mr. Cieszkowski said they were moving right along with the Master Plan and had no other correspondence to share.

Mr. Horsfall reported at their last meeting they finished reviewing all the zoning designations and the descriptions of some of the interesting land uses. They made corrections to more accurately define some of the zoning designations. For instance, they did away with the Office designation but made sure it was available in other zoning classifications. The Master Plan was updated and Mr. Peetz sent a draft to the members.
on the 30th. This Thursday, September 13th, they would meet to review anything else so they could vote on it the 20th and send it to the Planning Commission in October.

Citizens’ Comments - none

Commission Member Comments

Mr. Cieszkowski asked that the members all make sure they have signed in for the meeting.

Announcements: The next Regular Planning and Zoning Commission meeting will be held Tuesday, October 9, 2018 at 7PM at the Streetsboro Municipal Building (555 Frost Road).

Adjournment
There being no further business before this Commission a motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Horsfall and seconded by Mr. Hillyer and the meeting was adjourned at 7:43 pm.

Attest:

_______________________  _______________________
Andrea Parma, Clerk        Jerome Pavlick, Chairperson
(typed by Stacey Vadaj, Zoning Inspector)