



**PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

27700 Hilliard Blvd.  
Westlake, OH 44145

Phone 440.871.3300  
Fax 440.617.4324

**WESTLAKE PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
MARCH 7, 2022**

Present: Chairman Brad Lamb, Matt Jones, Duane Van Dyke, Lauren Falcone  
Also Present: Planning Director Jim Bedell, Assistant Law Director Robin Leasure, Clerk of Commissions  
Nicolette Sackman

The regular meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Lamb.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mrs. Falcone moved, seconded by Mr. Jones to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of February 7, 2022.

**ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:**

Yeas: Falcone, Van Dyke, Jones, Lamb

Nays: None, motion carried

Mrs. Falcone moved, seconded by Mr. Jones to approve the amended minutes of the work session of February 7, 2022.

**ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:**

Yeas: Falcone, Van Dyke, Jones, Lamb

Nays: None, motion carried

**COUNCIL REPORT**

Councilman Van Dyke reported on council matters.

**BUSINESS**

**Convergent Site Improvements (sculpture lighting), 2 Equity Way,  
PP#21120001, rep. D. Robar, Ward 3**

Mr. Robar reviewed the proposed uplighting for the sculpture. The lighting will be white in color, although it has the capability to be changed, and is dimmable. There will be five fixtures. Mr. Bedell reviewed his staff memo and noted uplighting is prohibited unless planning commission approves the proposal.

**Findings of Fact**

1. The proposed uplighting requires Planning Commission Approval.
2. It meets the requirements in 1230.03(h) and the City's exterior lighting consultant recommends approval.

Motion: Ms. Falcone moved, seconded by Mr. Jones to recommend approval of the Convergent Site Improvements (sculpture lighting).

**ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:**

Yeas: Van Dyke, Jones, Lamb, Falcone

Nays: None, motion carried

**Corporate Circle Lot Split, Corporate Circle, PP#21126075, rep. J.  
Plautz, Ward 5**

Mr. Plautz explained the proposal is to split the property into three parcels for the retail and office buildings. Mr. Bedell reviewed his staff memo explaining this is being done for financing, tax purposes and to align the new parcels with the development. At this time, the properties will continue to be owned by the applicant with no change in any development plans resulting from this action.

Discussion ensued with the planning commission and Mr. Rubin who explained this enables different entities to provide financing. Some companies finance retail uses and others finance office uses. There is already reciprocal easement agreements recorded, so all parcels have access to the driveways and connection to the street.

#### Findings of Fact

1. The lot splits are for financing and tax purposes and will align the new parcels with the development.
2. There are no changes in any development plans resulting from this action.
3. If the properties are sold off in the future, new owners will be "...bound by reciprocal easement agreements covering all the land within the PUD, by a person or a group of owners acting jointly under a planned development procedure" in accordance with Section 1212.03.
4. Such lot splits were routinely approved within the Crocker Park PUD for the same reasons listed above.

Motion: Ms. Falcone moved, seconded by Mr. Jones to approve the Corporate Circle Lot Split involving permanent parcel number 21126075 with the condition that approval is subject to the plat meeting the requirements of the County and State as indicated in the Ohio Revised Code and approval by the Engineering Department in compliance with the code and the ordinances of the City of Westlake.

#### ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Van Dyke, Jones, Lamb, Falcone

Nays: None, motion carried

### **Nike Live Storefront & Sign Plan, 236 Main St., PP#21124308, rep. M. Farr, Ward 5**

---

Mr. Farr reviewed the proposal explaining the storefront is simple metal panels with an artistic vinyl mural on the entire tenant face. The graphics are designed by an artist for Nike. There will also be a Nike swoosh and blade sign. Mr. Bedell reviewed his staff memo. The commission will need to decide if the mural is public art or signage. If it is



considered signage the total area exceeds what is permitted by more than 700 sf. If the mural is art, the sign plan complies and is under what is permitted. The only exception is the changeable copy window sign, which requires a waiver from the master sign criteria as it is not a type identified for window signs. He presented examples of other murals in Crocker Park and which ones were considered art and which one were considered signage.

Members of the commission discussed the proposal. It was questioned if this mural is used at other locations. Mr. Farr explained other locations have similar murals but each one is individually designed by the artist. It was the consensus that the mural was signage as it was part of the Nike branding as very similar murals are used at other locations. There were concerns with the large size of the mural as to approve the signage would result in a huge modification over what is permitted and they did not want to set a precedent. The commission was not necessarily opposed to a mural but would like to see other smaller options. If the mural were to be removed, the storefront should be revisited as without the mural it would be plain metal panels. It was suggested that the applicant look at revisions to present at the next meeting.

Motion: Ms. Falcone moved, seconded by Mr. Jones to table the Nike Live Storefront and Sign Plan to the April 4, 2022 meeting.

#### ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Van Dyke, Jones, Lamb, Falcone

Nays: None, motion carried

### **Pulpo Beer Co. Sign Plan, 20 Main St., PP#21125004, rep. M. Farr, Ward 5**

---

Mr. Farr reviewed the proposal for a feature sign that is an octopus wrapped around a sign in the shape of Ohio and holding a glass of beer. The copy and beer glass is internally illuminated. The second sign looks old-fashioned and includes exposed bulbs in 3' tall channel letters. The height of the octopus needs a waiver as proposed. If it were to be located 12' from grade it would not be centered on the wall above the entrance. A 10' height centers the sign and is aesthetically pleasing. It would also line up with the wall sign. He advised the existing storefront is not being changed but will be freshened up to look new again.

Mr. Bedell reviewed his staff memo and agreed with Mr. Farr that the sign looks better at a height of 10'. Members of the commission reviewed the proposal and it was clarified that the octopus does not illuminate but the other portions do. All agreed placing the sign at 10' was preferred and liked the creativity of the signs.

#### Findings of Fact

1. The Crocker Park Master Sign Criteria encourages creativity in design of signs to "...contribute to the vitality and interest of Crocker Park, while respecting the variety of the architecture, creating a lively and provocative atmosphere."
2. The waivers are reasonable and improve the overall design of the signs.

Motion: Ms. Falcone moved, seconded by Mr. Jones to approve the Pulpo Beer Co. Sign Plan with the following waivers:

1. Waiver for a minimum clearance of ten feet under the feature sign.
2. Waiver for open pan channel letters to have "marquee-style LED bulbs" in place of neon.

#### ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Van Dyke, Jones, Lamb, Falcone

Nays: None, motion carried

### **Aldi Sign Plan, 30700 Detroit Rd., PP#21118019, rep. K. Clark, PP#21118019, Ward 5**

---

Ms. Clark reviewed the proposal for two box signs on the wall. They are requesting that the signs are allowed to be higher on the building than permitted so they will be centered on the architectural gable features of the building. Mr. Bedell reviewed his staff memo. The proposed area complies but a modification is needed for the height of the signs and a waiver from the master sign criteria for the color of the sign (same waiver that was granted for the existing sign). Members of the commission agreed that the proposed location was in proportion on the wall and supported a height modification.

#### Findings of Fact

1. The existing wall sign was granted modifications in 2004 for a box sign with individual white lettering mounted to it and five colors (two shades of blue, two shades of orange, yellow). This differs from the sign criteria for the shopping center that calls for red letters.
2. In addition, a condition was included regarding the brightness of the sign being compliant with Section 1223.07, Illumination of Signs.
3. These modifications and condition are repeated in the draft motion below.
4. An additional modification is needed for the height of the signs to be more than twenty feet above the finished grade below the signs is acceptable due to the location, placement, scale and architecture of the building.
5. The Planning Commission may grant modifications for signage pursuant to 1223.13 (h) "based on Planning Commission's consideration of the sign proposed, the general characteristics of the proposed site and surrounding area, and any unique or unusual circumstances which, in the exercise of their sound judgment, justify a modification of any requirement, or specification while maintaining the overall purpose and integrity of the sign regulations."

Motion: Ms. Falcone moved, seconded by Mr. Jones to approve the Aldi Sign Plan with the following:

1. Modification for the signs to be of a box sign design with individual lettering/logo exceeding 24", colors different from the master sign criteria, and located more than above 20 feet above finished grade.
2. Condition that signage comply with the illumination performance regulations in Chapter 1223.

#### ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Van Dyke, Jones, Lamb, Falcone

Nays: None, motion carried

*Planning Commission Minutes*

*March 7, 2022*

*Page 3 of 9*

**Starbucks Sign Plan, 30225 Detroit, PP#21125002, rep. K. Moffatt,  
Ward 5, tabled 11/8/21, 12/6/21, 1/10/22, 2/7/22**

---

Mr. Bedell advised revised plans have not been received to date. Ms. Sackman advised she received an email from the applicant's contractor wanting to have the proposal on a different meeting. She did ask the contractor what the status of the sign was as it has been pending for multiple months but did not receive a response. Members of the commission decided to act on the proposal and if a new plan is received in the future, it can go back through the process.

Motion: Ms. Falcone moved, seconded by Mr. Jones to approve the Starbucks Sign Plan.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: None

Nays: Van Dyke, Jones, Lamb, Falcone, motion failed

**The Apartments at Vitalia Development Plan, 26695 Center Ridge,  
PP#21501042, rep. L. Apple, Ward 2, tabled 1/10/22**

---

Mr. Apple and Mr. Biales were present and reviewed the revised plan shifting the building to the east so it is further away from the existing building. A modification is still needed but if the building were setback so no modification between buildings were needed the new building would be closer to the residents and need a modification for that setback.

Mr. Bedell reviewed his staff memo. The canvas awning between the two buildings has been reconfigured due to the change in the building setback. The awning does not constitute a new building addition and does not cause the buildings to be considered connected or the existing building to be enlarged. The awning is simply a structure. The new building will be a non-age restricted rental apartment building and not an independent living facility or an expansion of their assisted living facility. He reviewed the fire access plan and additional landscaping.

Members of the commission reviewed the proposal, what the applicant's facilities are at other locations, the distance between buildings, density, lot coverage, green space, fire access, and if the building could be made smaller to eliminate any modifications. Mr. Bedell reviewed the setback between buildings in detail and the applicant did not want to lose any units as a previous plan had 18 units and now 16 are proposed.

Findings of Fact

1. The conditions are typical for new development (e.g. administrative lighting review, mechanical protrusions, etc.), except that a condition is needed regarding the future use of the building for apartments and not for senior services.
2. Signage is not included in this approval.
3. A modification for a reduction in the distance between buildings makes more sense than shifting the building to meet the distance requirement, because this modification is internal to the site, whereas a shift would cause the building to encroach into the side yard setback and closer to the neighboring residences and there are no issues with lot coverage, open space, or the fire code resulting from this modification.

Motion: Ms. Falcone moved, seconded by Mr. Jones to recommend approval of the Apartments at Vitalia Development Plan with the following:

1. Modification for a reduction in the distance between buildings.
2. Condition that lighting will be administratively approved or submitted to the Planning Commission if it does not comply with Section 1230.03.
3. Condition that signage is presented at a future meeting.
4. Condition that any mechanical system protrusions from the walls or roof will be colored to match adjacent materials.
5. Condition that this building is not used as an assisted living, memory care, or independent living facility.
6. Condition that sound from the air conditioning condensers will be less than 50dB at the nearest residential lot line.
7. Approval is subject to comments in Part III of the 3/4/22 staff report and approval of the final plans by the Building and Engineering Departments in compliance with the code and the ordinances of the City of Westlake; and, in the development process, should there be any changes necessitated by engineering

requirements that visually alter the appearance of the development approved by the Planning Commission, the plan shall be re-submitted to the Planning Commission.

**ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:**

Yeas: Jones, Lamb, Falcone

Nays: Van Dyke, motion carried

**Bailey Woods Major Subdivision Preliminary Plan (7 lots), 29883 & 29765 Center Ridge Rd., PP#21726004, 006, 007, 012, rep. K. Hoffman, Ward 6, tabled 2/7/22**

Mr. Hoffman presented a very conceptual plan for how the multi-family lots could possibly be developed for townhomes. This was done to demonstrate how the lots could be developed and the setback for subplot 1 due to the shifting of the new street to the west. The sidewalk along the western edge of Mr. Schnell's property has been removed so additional buffering can be provided. Mr. Schnell's driveway encroaches on the applicant's property so an access easement will be provided and the private driveway to the townhomes will also be in this location. After the last meeting, several residents spoke to the applicant and requested that the front yard setback on the single-family lots be 40' rather than 50' as required by code. This was requested to allow homes to possibly be located further away from the existing homes on Sequoia Trail. Lots 4 and 5 must maintain a 50' setback to comply with the 100' required frontage at the front yard setback.



Mr. Bedell reviewed his staff memo. He stressed that the townhome plan is a conceptual plan, can change in the future, and is being shown so the commission can see setbacks based on the request to shift the street to the west, not for approval review. The request is for a residential subdivision with seven lots. The two lots along Center Ridge are zoned multi-family and the applicant has indicated plans to develop them as townhomes but any permitted use can be constructed on the parcels. The five lots at the rear are zoned single family. This is a preliminary plan for a subdivision and he reviewed the lots (setbacks, area and lot to depth ratio), tree preservation, buffering (not required between single family uses but would be required for lots 1 and 2 in the future if developed with townhomes). Townhomes require development plan approval and neighbors within 500' would be notified. If they are developed as two residential home lots, development plan approval and notification is not required and they would be approved by the Building and Engineering Departments for single-family residential construction.

The following made comments: Ken Didion, 29910 Sequoia Trail; Chip Vandalen 29920 Sequoia Trail; Audrey Jones and Brian Schnell, 29819 Center Ridge. Comments and concerns expressed were: some of the Bretton Woods Subdivision owners asked that the commission consider allowing 40' front yard setbacks for the single family lots that back up to Sequoia Trail so houses could be further away from their property; concerns with the grade of the property and drainage; loss of privacy; concerns with how close the new street and private driveway will be to the house on Center Ridge; security and safety risks; townhomes would be visible and not desirable next to houses; loss of trees; decreased property values and the loss of use for the home on Center Ridge; visibility into rear yards due to heights of townhomes; where are there other century homes surrounded by development such as what is being proposed; plans for this property have been ongoing for years; the home on Center Ridge becomes an island with this development; setbacks are not sufficient; plans for what the townhome will look like have not been provided.

Members of the commission discussed the proposal. Mr. Hoffman explained the property is existing and has some constraints as an infill parcel with the adjacent parcel in the middle of the proposal. However, the lots along Center Ridge are zoned multi-family and can be developed for multi-family units. It was discussed that a modification can be granted to allow the 40' front yard setbacks and would become part of the ordinance council would need to approve for the subdivision if they were in favor of the request. There are other homes in the city with similar situations where development wrapped around a parcel with a per-existing house. The following was discussed: a

Planning Commission Minutes  
March 7, 2022  
Page 5 of 9

single family house can be built on one of the multi-family lots; before the development plan is submitted the applicant should explore options to move the conceptual driveway off Center Ridge and have it connect to the new street, and the conceptual stand-alone unit needs to be removed; review proposed setbacks by the home on Center Ridge; the driveway easement and configuring that into the drive for possible townhomes to leave more green space; suggested possible mounds as part of the townhouse development plan; and fewer curb cuts on Center Ridge is desirable.

#### Findings of Fact

1. The proposal is supported by the Guide Plan and Zoning.
2. Modifications are necessary in accordance with 1127.01 and 1133.02 being “the land involved in a subdivision is of such size or shape ... that it is impossible or impracticable in the particular proposal for the developer to conform fully to a provision of these Land Planning and Subdivision Regulations.” Three lots have lot depth to width ratios that are slightly under the requirement and a little more square than rectangular and four lots have 1.5’ 3.03’ – 9.12’ less depth than required by code with the least depth being 160.88’.
3. In order to develop Sublot 1, as indicated in “PRELIMINARY PLAN AERIAL OVERLAY w/TOWNHOME SCHEMATIC”, a 40’ front yard setback modification is needed from the new roadway. This is necessary because the revised layout provides an additional 10’ offset from the roadway to 29819 Center Ridge Road. If this subdivision is approved and setback modification is granted, the entire space between the roadway and 29819 Center Ridge Road should be buffered with landscaping, while the maintaining the unobstructed site zone and eliminating the sidewalk in this area to enhance privacy and provide additional room for buffer.
4. Tree preservation and buffering plans are needed for Sublots 1 and 7/.
5. In accordance with 1137.05 (b) for sublots 2-6, the preliminary subdivision plan needs to indicate areas which have existing trees or groupings of trees with a D.B.H. of eight inches or greater. Improvement plans and individual building plot plans shall indicate trees or areas of trees the developer intends to preserve.

Motion: Ms. Falcone moved, seconded by Mr. Jones to recommend approval of the Bailey Woods Major Subdivision:

1. Modification for the depth to width ratios for Sublots 3, 4, and 6 and for lot depth for Sublots 3, 4, 5 and 6.
2. Modification for sublots 1, 2, 3 and 6 to have a front yard setback from the proposed roadway of 40’ for townhomes.
3. Condition that the preliminary subdivision plan indicates areas which have existing trees or groupings of trees with a D.B.H. of eight inches or greater.
4. Condition that Planning Department staff will be notified prior to the removal of any trees.
5. Condition that approval is subject to comments in Part III of the 3/4/22 staff report and approval of the preliminary plan by the Engineering Department in compliance with the code and the ordinances of the City of Westlake; and, in the development process, should there be any changes necessitated by engineering requirements that visually alter the appearance of the development approved by the Planning Commission, the plan shall be re-submitted to the Planning Commission.

#### ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Van Dyke, Jones, Lamb, Falcone

Nays: None, motion carried

### **Ordinance 2022-5 rezoning 28189 and 28239 Detroit Rd from R-1F-80 District to R-MF-40 District, ref. 1/20/22, Ward 5**

Mr. Kopasakis (owner 28189 Detroit) and Mr. Wood (owner 28239 Detroit) were present. Mr. Kopasakis explained they would like to rezone their property similarly to the adjacent property to the east that was rezoned last year. They are not developers and have no plans for the development of the property. He was uncertain if the adjacent property owner would purchase the property for their development or if someone else would purchase the property. Mr. Bedell reviewed his staff memo explaining these properties could be developed for any main or conditional uses in the RMF-40 district, such as 6 single family or cluster homes, 13 duplex homes, 18 townhomes, or a public or quasi-public nonprofit recreational or community center. He noted if approved the Guide Plan should be updated.

The following were present: Kevin Hoffman, Polaris Engineering (Mr. Pavicic’s engineer); Marueen Stein, 1706 Coe’s Post; and Mrs. Muhammad, 1715 Coe’s Post. Comments and concerns expressed were: the adjacent property owner (Mr. Pavicic) supported the request; residential neighbors to the south were opposed to the request; loss of

*Planning Commission Minutes*

*March 7, 2022*

*Page 6 of 9*

trees and green space; noise; concerns buffering will not be maintained as the adjacent Rae Ann landscape buffer has not been maintained and trees died, were removed and not replaced; vehicle lights shining into homes and yards; if there will be mounds and screening; and decreased property values; and if this property becomes part of the property to the east there could be more multi-family units.

Ms. Leasure advised she will look into issues raised regarding the buffer mound and screening issues raised at Rae Ann. Members of the commission discussed the proposal. If the parcel were not assembled to the adjacent property, the long narrow lot would not be able to be developed at the rear portion of the parcel due to the 65' width. Mr. Wood advised that the property owner to the east approached them to purchase the property but did not offer enough money. Members felt the request made sense since there is multi-family property adjacent and across the street, and to the west is a multi-family nursing home business. The request is to rezone the property and, if in the future a development plan is submitted, the buffering, trees preservation and development would be reviewed and neighbors would be notified. There is no conceptual plan for the development of the parcels, which is not a code requirement for rezoning requests.

#### Findings of Fact

1. The Westlake Guide Plan's future land use map does not support the proposed rezoning and will need to be amended to be consistent with the change of use.
2. If rezoned, the applicant, a prospective developer or a future land owner will be able to apply for approval of a development for any main or conditional use in the RMF-40 district, such as single family or cluster homes, duplex homes, townhomes, or a public or quasi-public nonprofit recreational or community center.
3. Any additional findings of fact – see "other considerations for rezoning" above.

Motion: Ms. Falcone moved, seconded by Mr. Jones recommend approval of Ordinance 2022-05.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Van Dyke, Jones, Lamb, Falcone

Nays: None, motion carried

#### **Dover Village Townhomes Development Plan, Hillsborough & Center Ridge, PP#21706033, rep. L. Sampat, Ward 6, tabled 12/6/21, 1/10/22**

Motion: Ms. Falcone moved, seconded by Mr. Jones to table the Dover Village Townhomes Development Plan to the April 4, 2022 meeting.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Van Dyke, Jones, Lamb, Falcone

Nays: None, motion carried

#### **Salty Mary's Oyster Bar and Tavern, Site Improvements & Sign Plan, 25600 Center Ridge Rd., PP# 21323014, rep. A. Gargari, Ward 2**

Mr. Gargari from Gargari Design and Mr. Slusarski from CAD Creations were present and reviewed the wall sign, color changes (greys, dark blue and black awnings) for the existing building and renovations. A fire place is being added so there will be an exterior chimney with the wall sign on the chimney. The patio configuration is not being changed but it is being updated with a roof and the patio door will be a roll up style door and there will be a slider door as well. The existing window will be changed to a pass through style window. Mr. Bedell reviewed his staff memo. He noted the adjacent trees are not on the applicant's property and should not be removed. Exterior lighting specifications need to be submitted.

Discussion ensued. It was suggested that a semi-gloss paint should be reconsidered as it will create a slight reflection and not accent any imperfections on the building. The locations of the different colors to be painted on the building were reviewed. The windows were reviewed and there are not muntins but the sliding door to the patio has muntins. Discussion ensued if all the windows should be the same, muntins or no muntins. Business owners Mr. Novack and Mrs. Novack explained muntins on the patio door was desirable so patrons would see the door and not walk into or through it. The patio will also be surrounded by a decorative fence as liquor will be served and that is required, with more information requested by the Planning Commission for it. The parking lot and drive is adjacent to the patio. The patio layout and doors were discussed. It was noted the driveway will be repaved. It was suggested that a test patch of the blue color on the gable is done and reviewed by Mr. Bedell.

Findings of Fact

1. The proposed signage and site improvements of the former Friendly's are mainly cosmetic and enhance the building architecture with contemporary colors and materials.
2. No zoning modifications are required.
3. The lighting for the wall sign may be approved. More information is required for the exterior lighting and it should not be approved.

Motion: Ms. Falcone moved, seconded by Mr. Jones to recommend approval of the Salty Mary's Oyster Bar Site Improvements with the following:

1. Condition that plans for exterior lighting and fence plans are submitted to the planning commission for review.
2. Condition that the gable is painted with a blue test patch for administrative review.
3. Condition that the window and sliding door final design for muntins is administratively approved.
4. Approval is subject to comments in Part III of the 3/4/22 staff report and approval of the final plans by the Building and Engineering Departments in compliance with the code and the ordinances of the City of Westlake; and, in the development process, should there be any changes necessitated by engineering requirements that visually alter the appearance of the development approved by the Planning Commission, the plan shall be re-submitted to the Planning Commission.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Van Dyke, Jones, Lamb, Falcone

Nays: None, motion carried

Motion: Ms. Falcone moved, seconded by Mr. Jones to approve the Salty Mary's Oyster Bar sign plan with the following:

1. Condition that lights are dimmable for field adjustment as needed and shall not exceed 4000k color temperature.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Van Dyke, Jones, Lamb, Falcone

Nays: None, motion carried

**Ordinance 2022-9 code amendment 1203.03(p) of the zoning code as to Public Notice, ref. 1/20/22**

Mr. Bedell reviewed his staff memo and explained the proposal is a cleanup of the code referencing the public notice requirements in the Charter as amended last year.

Motion: Ms. Falcone moved, seconded by Mr. Jones to recommend approval of Ordinance 2022-9 as revised.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Van Dyke, Jones, Lamb, Falcone

Nays: None, motion carried

**MISCELLANEOUS**

Councilman Van Dyke suggested that the commission should have staff limit the number of items on the agenda due to the length of meetings and the volume of information to be reviewed and processed by both staff and commission members. It should be explored if additional meetings should be added when there are a large number of items submitted for a specific meeting due to time constraints. Also there is a concern that at times items are being submitted at the last minute with little or no time to review an item. If items are not submitted on a timely matter they should be tabled. Mr. Bedell questioned if the commission would like to consider a time limit for public comment, as many communities do have time limits (*Ohio Sunshine Laws – Open Meetings Act: Right to hear but not to be heard or to disrupt*). This would be done for all items so all are treated fairly. Typical time limits are three or five minutes and the commission could waive that for a specific topic.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 11:00 p.m. The next regular meeting is scheduled for Monday, April 4, 2022, in the Westlake City Hall Council Chambers.

---

Chairman Brad Lamb

---

Nicolette Sackman, MMC  
Clerk of Commissions

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_