

**CITY OF MEDINA  
PLANNING COMMISSION**

Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday February 13, 2018

1. **Call to Order:** Acting Chairperson Albers called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Present: Planning Commissioners Todd Albers, Aaron Amic, Dino DesLauriers, Kerby Nester, and Robin Reid.

Absent: Planning Commissioner Janet White and Rashmi Williams.

Also Present: City Planner Dusty Finke.

2. **Public Comments on Items not on the Agenda**

No comments made.

3. **Update from City Council Proceedings**

Cousineau reported that the Council recently approved the amendment to the commercial business zoning district and the Maxxon lot combination and site plan review as recommended by the Planning Commission. She reported that the Council will hold the annual business tour on March 8<sup>th</sup>, beginning at 7:30 a.m., which begins with a business forum and then a tour of three local businesses. She welcomed any interested Planning Commissioners to attend.

4. **Planning Department Report**

Finke provided an update.

5. **Ordinance Amendment – Chapter 8 of the City Code Related to the Requirements of the Single Family Residential (R1), Single and Two Family Residential (R2), and Residential-Mid Density (R3) Zoning Districts**

Finke stated that this is the first of various subjects that will be discussed throughout the year related to the zoning districts, as the official controls will need to be changed to ensure compliance with the draft Comprehensive Plan that will soon be in place. He stated that the focus today is on low density and medium density, noting that the range has changed for the medium density zoning district under the draft Comprehensive Plan. He displayed that land use map and identified the locations of the low and medium density residential districts, narrowing that down to the properties that are left to develop under those guides. He explained the proposed changes that would apply to the R2 and R3 districts. He provided additional details on the maximum eave height and the safety reasoning behind that maximum. He reviewed the side yard setbacks on the R1 zoning district and advised of comments that staff has received from builders. He reviewed the maximum proposed number of townhomes that would be allowed in one cluster.

Albers opened the public hearing at 7:27 p.m.

No comments made.

Albers closed the public hearing at 7:27 p.m.

Albers asked if there is any concern from the Commission with any of the changes proposed.

Reid stated that she would prefer to keep the side yard setbacks as they currently exist. She stated that she does not like houses very close together and she would not want to give up that additional five feet. She commented that the trend of having large homes on small lots is unfortunate and she would prefer to keep the side yard setback as it currently exists rather than decreasing that setback.

Finke reviewed the items that would need to be considered for the zoning districts to be changed in order to be in compliance with the draft Comprehensive Plan and noted that some of the other elements could continue to be discussed/changed.

Reid referenced the maximum eave height and recognized the concern from the fire department.

Finke stated that what is being advocated is not any taller. He explained that the change could result in homes being five or six inches higher, as the difference could be accommodated in the pitch of the roof.

Reid referenced the language regarding the reduction in setback, if the property backs up to park land.

Finke explained that historically the City has allowed the ten-foot reduction in setback for properties that back up to parkland. He clarified that the change would be to specify that it is not allowed, if the Commission does not want to allow that reduction.

The consensus of the Commission was not to allow the reduced setback for properties adjacent to parkland.

Finke stated that because the City has allowed this reduction in many cases, this would introduce non-compliance in the instances where it has been allowed. He explained what that would mean for those properties that would become nonconforming. He explained that what exists today for those properties would be fine, but there could be restrictions as to what those property owners could do in the future (decks, additions, etc.). He provided options that could address that issue.

It was the consensus of the Commission to direct staff to draft an amendment to the nonconforming use policy related to setbacks that would allow for an addition that is in line with an existing nonconformity.

Finke referenced the rear setback adjacent to a park. He explained that the intent of the rear yard setback is to provide benefit to the property owner behind the property. He stated that the argument could be that if a property backs up to parkland, there is no property owner that would need that benefit.

Albers noted that the benefit would be provided to the public, as a whole, because the land is public parkland rather than providing a benefit to the specific property owner to allow their home a reduced setback.

Nester referenced the mention of garages for multi-family structures and asked for additional information.

Finke explained that in order to be allowed a higher density, different design elements could be added, such as larger garages. He stated that the elements he highlighted are just highlights, but the entire ordinance is on the table for discussion.

Nester stated that she is unsure that she likes the idea of two-family homes within the low-density land use.

Finke provided additional details on how that tool could be used. He provided an example of twinhomes that exist in Medina.

Albers asked if there has been a thought to increasing the number of front yard trees.

Finke replied that some of the R2 lots would not have space for more than two trees, as the driveway would take up about half of that space.

Albers asked about the possibility of requiring trees in the backyard.

Reid and DesLauriers stated that they would be in favor of more trees.

Amic asked and received confirmation that backyard trees are not required.

Finke stated that the reality is that the trees could get in the way of what a homeowner would like to do with their backyard. He stated that there are replacement tree plans and, in essence, replacement trees could be done in the backyards.

Albers asked if it would make sense to add language for backyard trees.

Finke stated that perhaps the thought is that the language would apply to a development which does not already have trees or replacement trees. He confirmed the consensus of the Commission. He stated that Medina has a unique front yard tree requirement, as Medina requires the trees to be setback out of the right-of-way. He stated that public works supports that requirement as there is less buckling of the sidewalk and less tree debris falling into the roadway.

DesLauriers referenced the decrease in the bands, noting that the proposed language would be narrowing the band that currently exists.

Finke explained that there were wider bands in the existing Comprehensive Plan as the density range was higher, so because the draft plan includes less range in density, the bands have been narrowed.

**Motion by Reid, seconded by DesLauriers**, to recommend adoption of the ordinance regarding the requirements of the R1, R2, and R3 residential zoning districts, with the change to the setback adjacent to parkland. Motion carries unanimously. (Absent: White and Williams)

#### 6. 2018 Planning Department Workplan

Finke stated that included in the packet was the workplan for the Planning Department for 2018.

7. **Approval of the January 18, 2018 Draft Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.**

**Motion by DesLauriers, seconded by Amic**, to approve the January 18, 2018, Planning Commission minutes with the change noted. Motion carries unanimously. (Absent: White and Williams)

8. **Council Meeting Schedule**

Finke advised that the Council will be meeting the following Tuesday and Nester volunteered to attend in representation of the Commission.

9. **Adjourn**

**Motion by DesLauriers, seconded by Amic**, to adjourn the meeting at 8:05 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.