

**CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
August 18, 2022 – 5:00 P.M.  
TOWN HALL MEETING**

Participants: Commission Members – Mr. Melosky, Mr. Malozi, Mr. Barker and Ms. Cohen. City staff included Ms. Heller and Mr. Peiffer of the Planning and Zoning Bureau, Ms. Collins of the Department of Community and Economic Development, Basel Yandem of the Engineering Bureau, and Attorney Matthew Deschler as Solicitor to the Commission. Attending in person were Atty. Fitzpatrick, Mr. Thakkar, Mr. McGeehan, Mr. Chirumbolo, Atty. Souders, Mr. Ayvazov, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Citrullo, Mr. Chambers, Mr. Portner, Ms. Salabsky and Ms. Lelko.

**1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – July 14, 2022.**

Mr. Malozi made a motion to approve the minutes of the July 14, 2022 Planning Commission meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Barker and passed with a 4-0 vote.

**2. LAND DEVELOPMENT AND SKETCH PLAN REVIEWS**

- A. (22-002 Sketch Plan Review) – 22060010 – 1559 KELCHNER ROAD – SKETCH PLAN REVIEW – Zoned RS, plan dated June 24, 2022.** The applicant proposes to construct four (4) single family dwellings on fee simple lots. The property contains 2 acres.

Atty. Fitzpatrick presented the project. Atty. Fitzpatrick mentioned that in the City's letter of July 20, 2022 it discusses a prohibition on improvements being made on the rear of the flag lot. He is not clear what this means. Mr. Melosky asked Ms. Heller to clarify this statement for Atty. Fitzpatrick. Ms. Heller stated that she was not in attendance at the Zoning Hearing Board but these are the conditions that came from the review and action from the Zoning Hearing Board. She believes, because the conceptual drawing show the buildings up front, the Zoning Hearing Board was trying to stay away from having long driveways and putting single family homes to the rear of the lots. Mr. Thakkar explained that the Zoning Hearing Board had asked him if the layout of this development was going to look substantially similar which meant if the Zoning Hearing Board was to grant relief that the mechanics of the plan were not going to change. Mr. Thakkar concurred but explained that some adjustment would take place when it came to building placement which meant that it would not be an exact carbon copy of the current sketch plan.

Mr. Peiffer explained that he was not part of the deliberation but to his recollection the board took a literal interpretation of this sketch plan. He continued to say that their comments centered largely around maintaining an open space in the rear of this lot. Mr. Pfeiffer stated that if the intent is to move the two homes substantially closer to the rear, then that's not what the Zoning Hearing Board granted. As such, the applicant would need to come back to the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mr. Melosky asked if there was any discussion on keeping four lots but moving lot two and three on the same side in an equal distance. This would allow one curb cut off of Kelchner Road into the center of the lot. Atty. Fitzpatrick responded that he understood what Mr. Melosky was proposing but 1) would they need another variance and 2) from a standpoint of subdividing and titling these deeds and getting mortgage lenders to agree on the common curb cut and going back and forth, Atty. Fitzpatrick stated it wouldn't work from a financial stand point.

Mr. Melosky asked Atty. Deschler to give his opinion. Atty. Deschler stated that the applicant should comply with the July 28, 2022 written decision.

Ms. Cohen asked about the lot sizes. She wanted to know why the front two lots are smaller than the rear lots. Mr. Thakkar responded that the first two lots are code compliant. The rear two lots are the larger lots

but required zoning relief. Mr. Melosky asked what is the square footage of the homes. Mr. Thakkar responded 1900 sq. ft or so foot print.

Mr. Malozi asked Mr. Thakkar why can't there be a 5<sup>th</sup> or 6<sup>th</sup> home added to the property, maybe a little more density. Mr. Thakkar responded that he did do the numbers on impervious but the idea was to not disrupt the neighborhood, in other words, for the trees to stay.

Mr. Melosky reiterated that the Planning Commission is not looking to change the decision that was made by the Zoning Hearing Board. As such, he continued to say that the applicant would comply with the July 28, 2022 written decision not necessarily the Zoning comments that were made on the City's July 20<sup>th</sup> letter.

There were no comments from the public.

- B. (21-016 LD) – 21120004 – Blake Street Apartments – 1036 Blake Street (formerly 778-775 Worthington Ave) Land Development Plan – Ward 14, Zoned RG, plan dated November 19, 2021 and revised May 21, 2022.** The applicant proposes the construction of a 2 1/2 story apartment building containing 8 dwelling units on a 0.77 acre lot.

Atty. Souders and Mr. Chirumbolo presented the project.

Ms. Cohen asked if they had an elevation of the building facing Blake Street. Mr. Chirumbolo stated they did not have one. Ms. Cohen asked if they can talk about the elevations facing the street as it appears there may be decks. Mr. McGeehan responded that the decks were cantilever decks. Ms. Cohen asked if there were windows and decks facing Blake St. Mr. McGeehan concurred. Ms. Cohen asked about the materials. Mr. McGeehan stated that the materials would be similar to Trex and vinyl siding on the elevation. Ms. Cohen also asked would there be stone like on the parking lot side. Mr. McGeehan responded there would not. Ms. Cohen stated she preferred to see a nicer elevation facing the street. Mr. Barker mentioned that Blake Street is a dead end and the properties that face Blake St. on the opposite side also have decks and grills on their side. Mr. Melosky concurred with Mr. Barker.

Mr. Malozi wanted to make sure he had clarity and asked Mr. McGeehan if Blake Street would be completely vinyl sided except for the decks and sliding doors out to the decks. Mr. McGeehan concurred. Mr. Malozi asked about the landscaping. Mr. Souder's showed the landscaping and lighting plan. Atty. Deschler asked about the abutting streets address. Mr. Chirumbolo stated 1051 Decatur St. / 1052 Blake St.

There were no comments from the public.

Mr. Malozi made a motion to approve the land development plan for Blake Street Apartments, 1036 Blake Street contingent upon three conditions: 1) All of the conditions outlined in the City's July 29, 2022 letter shall be met. 2) Applicant needs to acquire easement from both abutting property owners along Norman St. (1051 Decatur St. & 1052 Blake St.). 3) Review and approval from City staff of the lighting and landscape plan, Sheet LA (1 of 1) dated April 7, 2022. The motion was seconded by Mr. Melosky and passed with a 4-0 vote.

- C. (22-007 LD&S) – 22040006– 128 E. 3<sup>RD</sup> ST. – Land Development and Subdivision Plan – WARD 3, Zoned CB, plan dated March 25, 2022 and revised July 5, 2022.** The applicant proposes to construct a 6-story mixed use building with retail on 1st floor and 55 dwelling units on a 0.257 acre lot.

Mr. Walsh presented the project. Mr. Melosky asked Ms. Heller if the City had any comments. Ms. Heller stated that HCC is looking closely at the components of the project and the applicant still has to go back to HCC for some final reviews of details of the project. Ms. Heller continued to say that when the projects are in the downtown area, parking is not required. Ms. Heller stated that Traffic would be looking for bike and pedestrian safety improvements and those comments are to come soon.

Mr. Melosky asked Mr. Ayvazov if he had any comments to add. Mr. Ayvazov mentioned that his original plans were a little different from the current ones, there were windows all around and a different type of brick and HCC was not in favor. He stated that the reason they changed the brick to red brick was to break the two colors. Mr. Ayvazov stated he is always looking for improvements and environmental efficiency and would like to do solar panels. Ms. Cohen asked about the EAC letter. Mr. Walsh stated that he can summarize what the letter stated. They mentioned the City's lighting and landscaping along the streets, solar panels and the bird friendly glass windows. The applicant will try to comply with their comments. Ms. Cohen asked about bike storage, having racks inside and outside. Mr. Walsh stated they have two bike racks outside totaling 6 as required for inside, they are still working through the amenity space and will keep bike storage in mind. Mr. Malozi asked what the residents will do for parking. Mr. Ayvazov stated he has been working with the Parking Authority and has an agreement drafted to lease 60 – 70 spots right behind their building.

There were no comments from the public.

Mr. Malozi made a motion to approve the land development and lot consolidation plan 128 E. 3<sup>rd</sup> St. contingent upon the conditions outlined in the City's August 3, 2022 letter. The motion was seconded by Mr. Barker and passed with a 4-0 vote.

- D. (22-009 LD) – 22040023– 1810 SPILLMAN DR. – Land Development Plan –Zoned IR, plan dated April 21, 2022 and revised July 11, 2022.** The applicant proposes to construct a 3-story building that contains a walk-in humidifier in the office space, ventilated offices and conference rooms, lounge areas open air work space and outdoor seating on a 4.4 acre lot.

Mr. Citrullo presented the project. Mr. Chambers talked about the building elevations of the project and Ms. Salabsky explained the operation side. Mr. Melosky asked Ms. Heller if she had any comments from the City's letter. Ms. Heller stated that she had two comments which are that the City limits the height of parking lot lights and the City does not support the requested waivers from landscaping requirements. The applicant responded that they would be able to meet both requirements. Mr. Malozi asked if the property is in the CRIZ and Ms. Heller responded it is not eligible for CRIZ. Ms. Cohen complimented the design of the building on both sides (4<sup>th</sup> St and Spillman Dr.).

There were no comments from the public.

Mr. Malozi made a motion to approve the land development plan for 1810 Spillman Drive contingent upon the conditions outlined in the City's August 9, 2022 letter. The motion was seconded by Mr. Melosky and passed with a 4-0 vote.

#### 4. DISCUSSIONS:

The meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

ATTEST:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Darlene Heller, Commission Secretary