

**MINUTES**  
**CITY OF WOOSTER PLANNING COMMISSION**

July 2, 2020

**I. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

Kyle Adams, Commission Chairman, called the meeting to order. Commission members Kyle Adams, Chuck Armbruster, Grant Mason, Mike Steiner, and Mark Weaver were present at the meeting. Commission members Sheree Brownson and Gil Ning were absent. Andrew Dutton, Planning and Zoning Manager, was present representing the City of Wooster.

**II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

Chuck Armbruster made a motion to approve the minutes of the June 4, 2020 meeting of the Planning Commission. Mike Steiner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously 5-0.

**III. APPLICATIONS**

***PC-20-16.***

Roger Kobilarcsik of the City of Wooster requested Conditional Use approval for a public parking lot on the north side of East South Street with parcel numbers 64-01549.001 and 64-01000.000 in a C-4 (Central Business) zoning district.

Roger Kobilarcsik, 538 North Market Street, stated that the proposal was for a parking lot on East South Street. He noted that there was limited parking in the area.

Mr. Adams opened the public hearing and asked if anyone from the public would like to address the Commission regarding the application. No one from the public was present to comment on the application. Mr. Adams closed the public hearing.

Chuck Armbruster made a motion to approve application PC-20-16 as submitted. Mark Weaver seconded the motion. Mark Weaver noted that the application was consistent with the Wooster Comprehensive Plan and the Downtown Master Plan. He also noted that the application met all of the conditional use requirements. The motion carried unanimously 5-0.

***PC-20-17.***

Roger Kobilarcsik of the City of Wooster requested Final Development Plan approval for a public parking lot on the north side of East South Street with parcel numbers 64-01549.001 and 64-01000.000 in a C-4 (Central Business) zoning district.

Roger Kobilarcsik, 538 North Market Street, stated that the proposal would facilitate development at the east end of Wooster.

Mark Weaver noted that the staff recommendation stated that the size and species of the landscaping needed to be indicated and the waste receptacle would require a variance from the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals. Mr. Kobilarcsik responded that the variance would be heard by the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals later in the evening and he would work with Andrew Dutton on the landscaping species.

Chuck Armbruster made a motion to approve application PC-20-17 as submitted with the following conditions:

1. The size and species of all landscaping shall be indicated and shall comply with the requirements of Chapter 1123.
2. Parking rows shall meet the requirements of Section 1123.05(b)(6)(C.) and waste receptacles shall meet the setback requirements of Section 1117.01(k)(2) or the project shall receive a variance from the Board of Building and Zoning Appeals.

Mike Steiner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously 5-0.

***PC-20-18.***

Chris Siart requesting Final Development Plan approval for a building addition at 3600 North Geyers Chapel Road in an I-2 (General Industrial) zoning district.

Chris Siart, 537 Main Street, Springfield, Massachusetts, stated that Daisy Brand was proposing to expand their facility at 3600 North Geyers Chapel Road. He explained that the proposal included a 23,000 sq. ft. dry warehouse expansion and a 10,000 sq. ft. blast cooler expansion. Mr. Siart continued that the expansions had been planned for the facility and future expansions were also shown on the submitted plans.

Mr. Siart stated that the façade would be constructed out of the same materials as the current building. He continued that the stormwater management facilities on the site were initially built to accommodate expansions planned.

Mark Weaver noted that the application met the applicable development standards. He also noted that Daisy had done a good job planning each stage of this development.

Chuck Armbruster made a motion to approve application PC-20-18 as submitted. Mike Steiner seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously 5-0.

***PC-20-14.***

John Long requested Conditional Use approval for building additions to a place of worship at 3186 Burbank Road in an R-1 (Suburban Single-Family Residential) zoning district.

Peter Schantz, 1320 North Bever Street, stated that the plan was for the expansion of the existing building that was built in 2005.

Ken Doyno, 2847 Penn Ave, Pittsburgh, PA, stated that expansions were proposed to the sanctuary, or gathering space, and to the east side of the building. Mr. Doyno continued that the expansion would increase the number of classrooms, relocate office spaces and provide areas for meeting space. Mr. Doyno stated that after 2005 the parking area was expanded and improved. He indicated that at that time, stormwater management facilities were improved to facilitate the growth of the building.

Mr. Doyno stated that a weekday entrance was proposed on the south face of the building. He indicated that the expansions would follow the character of the existing building and utilize some of the materials used in the area. Mr. Doyno indicated that the building would continue the pattern of open windows,

covering roughly 50 percent of the façade. He noted that the sloped roofing would allow for the mounting of solar panels.

Louise Keating, 141 East Liberty Street, stated that the expansion did not change responses to Conditional Use criteria, as the church began their existence on the site as Conditional Use. She continued that the zoning code did not give automatic approval to a church in any zoning district. Mrs. Keating stated that when the church was first established, it was evaluated by the Planning Commission, and many of the items to consider remained the same.

Mrs. Keating explained that the access drive would remain unchanged from Burbank Road, which was a major arterial road. She continued that the actual use of the property was not changing. Mrs. Keating explained that the development would be harmonious and consistent in appearance with the existing building. Mrs. Keating continued that there was no significant change in the appearance or scale of the building.

Mrs. Keating stated that the building would be longer on an east-west axis, but would not project significantly further to the north or south. Mrs. Keating continued that in the 15 years since the church first came to the property, there had been growth to the north.

Mrs. Keating stated that the residential development on Cannon Drive and areas east of the site were developed before the church. Mrs. Keating stated that no features would be demolished as a result of expansions. She noted that the coverage of the lot would be well below what would be permitted for the large parcel.

Mrs. Keating explained that the wooden fencing had fallen into disrepair and would be repaired. She also noted that neighbors would like areas on the west side of the property, which was a meadow, to be mowed. Mrs. Keating stated that the project had provided an opportunity for neighbors to voice their concerns, which was a good opening for dialog.

Mrs. Keating stated that there had been concerns raised by neighbors regarding the rental property owned by the church along Burbank Road, which was not a part of the expansion project. Mrs. Keating continued that the review criteria had been met and neighbor concerns would be addressed.

Mr. Adams opened the public hearing and asked if anyone from the public would like to address the Commission regarding the application. The following public comments were entered on YouTube and conveyed to the Commission:

Charles Hamilton – 131 Cannon Drive  
Surface drainage has not been addressed

Chris and Katie Butler – 185 Cannon Drive  
We would first like to thank the Commission for their time and careful consideration. As mentioned in our comments prior to the meeting we have significant water runoff issues on our property.

I would like to note that our house was built in 1978 and there is no evidence of water issues until after 2005 when the Church was built. Our house was waterproofed in 2010.

I would like to know what, if anything is being done to address these water issues. I find it hard to believe that the Church building and lot is not somewhat responsible for these water issues.

Charles Hamilton

promise to tell the truth We have significant drainage issues with our back yard related to mound and the initial building.

I have asked Andrew to present our petition and and all of our presentations I would like to see them addressed one at a mtime

the retention pond behind our house is NOT connected to our back yards!

Susan English – 436 Kinney Circle

I am a member of the church and live nearby. I am delighted that we are able to expand because of the number of new families who have joined us in recent years. My address is 436 Kinney Circle. I also submitted an email message prior to the meeting.

Charles Hamilton

Engineers position is not effective! why not visit the site and see the reality of our back yards.

Chris and Katie Butler

We appreciate Mr. Long's response. However this facility is a non residential facility being build in an R1 zoned residential area.

It is obvious to us that the area cannot handle the large amount of runoff associated with the lot and buildings of the church.

We ask the Commission to carefully consider the consequences of the approval of any additions to this site.

Charles Hamilton

It may be working to his design but are yards are flooding now due to this mound not allowing for our runoff as it did prior to the mound. The mound forces the water into our backyard!Technically he is correct but the mound c hasnged that nimpacting us! The mound forces the water into our backyard!Technically he is correct but the mound c hasnged that nimpacting us!Technically he is correct but the mound has changed the flow from our backyard.

John Long, 3477 Commerce Parkway, responded to public comments. He stated that his firm was the Engineer on the original project and the Engineer on the subject project. Mr. Long explained that at the time of the original project, the stormwater management system complied with the city's regulations. He continued that topographic surveys were completed before the project took place. Mr. Long stated that he believed that the flow of water had not been cut off from the properties to the south and the drainage pattern had not been affected. Mr. Long explained that the flow of water always went from the northeast to the southwest. He continued that there were three stormwater retention basins on the property, one on the north end by the driveway coming off of Burbank Road, a second in the southeast corner of the site and the third on the west side of the site.

Kyle Adams asked what the impact the new construction would have on the existing stormwater system. Mr. Long stated that the initial stormwater system was sized for the proposed expansion to the building. He noted that the initial plans for the development of the site indicated future expansions on the east and west sides of the building.

Chuck Armbruster asked if the stormwater system was working as designed and if stormwater was running to the south. Mr. Long stated water was not running to the south and noted there was an existing mound along the south property line. He indicated all stormwater on the site was routed to the stormwater basins.

Mr. Adams noted that no additional comments had been entered by the public and closed the public hearing.

Chuck Armbruster asked if the parking area would need to be expanded in the future. Mr. Schantz stated that there was a parking study done and capacity was adequate. Mr. Armbruster suggested that the fence should be expanded from the eastern and western ends of the parking area to provide additional screening from the neighbors. Mr. Schantz responded that the fence could be expanded. Mr. Armbruster noted the applicant should work with the neighbors to construct, or not construct, fencing based on each neighbor's preference. Mr. Schantz said he would work with the neighbors on fencing.

Mike Steiner asked what the church's active membership was in 2005 and in 2020. Mr. Schantz stated that the church had outgrown the building and the addition was sized to accommodate future growth over the next 15 years. Mr. Doyno stated that the current building had 140 seats when in full capacity and the plan increased capacity to approximately 240 seats. Mr. Schantz indicated that there were 150 members in 2005 and 200 current members.

Mr. Steiner asked if neighbors had brought up issues before the proposed expansion. Mr. Schantz stated that he was not aware of any issues before the expansion notices went out to the neighbors. Mr. Steiner asked if neighbors had brought up drainage issues with the city prior to the proposed expansion. Andrew Dutton responded that he was not aware of any discussions regarding drainage issues in the area prior to the proposed expansion.

Mark Weaver asked if city stormwater management and site development standards would still need to be met for the proposal. Mr. Dutton responded that a Development Permit would be required through the City's Engineering Division. He noted that through the permit the City Engineering Division would evaluate drainage.

Mr. Dutton noted the following additional comments had been entered by the public. The additional comments were shared with the Commission:

Charles Hamilton

Drainage of our lots prior to 2005 allowed water to flow north I have lived here 30 years and I have seen it. They never worked with the neighbors! we do not trust them to do what is right. They are not working with us!!!! We do not trust them! Fence discussion is not true Peter is not presenting the truth. Sorry Peter's fence discussion is not true! The church never reached out to us

because they actually knew of the issues. They have no concern for us. Who would we address issues with.

I don't see that our issues were presented fairly as Andrew promised me. discuss the petition! We would like to file an official protest that we were not represented fairly. The community that is directly impacted by this does not want this! Please listen to us.

Chris and Katie Butler

We have no further comments. Thank you for your consideration.

David Francis – 2289 N. Reedsburg

I have served on the board for 4 years. We have not had complaints expressed to us.

Chuck Armbruster made a motion to approve application PC-20-14 as submitted. Mike Steiner seconded the motion.

Mark Weaver asked for clarification of the motion regarding fencing. Mr. Armbruster stated that the applicant agreed to work on good faith to extend fencing and noted that the fence could be from the easternmost parking space to the westernmost parking space.

Mark Weaver stated that the Planning Commission received all the emails and comments submitted prior to the meeting and he indicated that he had read them. Mr. Armbruster concurred with Mr. Weaver.

The motion carried 4-1 with Kyle Adams, Chuck Armbruster, Mike Steiner, and Mark Weaver voting for approval and Grant Mason voting against approval.

***PC-20-15.***

John Long requested Final Development Plan approval for building additions to a place of worship at 3186 Burbank Road in an R-1 (Suburban Single-Family Residential) zoning district.

John Long, 3477 Commerce Parkway, stated that items regarding the development plan had been previously discussed. He noted that the project would need to go through the Building Standards and Engineering Divisions for stormwater runoff review. Mr. Long continued that a Zoning Certificate would be required, including fence repairs and extensions.

Chuck Armbruster made a motion to approve application PC-20-15 as submitted with the condition that the existing fence that was in disrepair shall be repaired or replaced. Mark Weaver seconded the motion. The motion carried 4-1 with Kyle Adams, Chuck Armbruster, Mike Steiner, and Mark Weaver voting for approval and Grant Mason voting against approval.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Mike Steiner moved to adjourn the meeting. Chuck Armbruster seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously 5-0.

---

Kyle Adams, Chairman

---

Carla Jessie, Administrative Assistant