

PLANNING COMMISSION
February 11, 2025 @ 6:30 PM

Steve Thorn called the meeting to order at 7:25 P.M.

Roll Call: Wes Hawkins, Ellie Stamm, Mayor Tammy Meyer, Steve Thorn (chair), Kevin Maloney (clerk)

Others Present: Randy Ellis (Mantua Chamber of Commerce), Phil Rath (DMRC), Juli Robine (Mantua Chamber of Commerce), Solicitor Bill Mason

- ❖ Reports from Chair & Clerk: Nothing to report.
- ❖ Minutes from October 8, 2024, were presented, and Wes made motion to approve, Ellie seconded, all voted in favor.

Old Business:

- DORA – Discussion regarding adopting a DORA in the Village

Randy stated after speaking with Jodi (Jake's Eats), we should consider using Vermillion as a benchmark. Businesses want to participate, but we need to consider compliance issues, safety & sanitation. Tammy mentioned it doesn't need to be 7 days a week. Steve stated it should be driven by the businesses. Randy pointed out that we need to consider number of PD officers needed, and budget impact it would have. Tammy mentioned that we need to consider trash cans in place, and service personnel on duty to empty them. Kevin noted that Ryan had previously been consulted on the matter, and felt it wouldn't be that much of a burden. Tammy stated there needs to be further discussions in the Village on the subject, including where the designated DORA area would be. Randy presented a proposed area for the DORA - From Italiano's around to Farmers Market area. Ellie asked if the business who are participating would commit to helping with the garbage removal. Phil mentioned that DMRC might also be able to chip in. Question was asked about whether DORA could be in area with residences. Kevin mentioned that it likely would be driven by the zoning in the area, which is "City Center". Discussion on possibly expanding to the lot behind Jakes, and possibly train depot property (if acquired by village). Bill stated that Garrettsville has not seen any safety/police issues related to their implementation of a DORA. Steve asked about where people would "hang out" in the DORA area. Randy noted the green space, new sidewalk on Main Street, possibly Prospect Street & Mini-park - putting up picnic tables or tables & chairs. Tammy asked who holds the insurance for the DORA area. Randy stated that it wasn't clear. Bill wasn't sure. Randy noted that businesses who already hold liquor licenses in DORA area would be granted the DORA license for no additional fee. Steve asked about public reaction to a DORA. Randy said he felt it would be positive, and that he's seen that Mantua Village is becoming more of a destination for people. Tammy mentioned that she had a copy of Garrettsville's DORA paperwork, and we could use this to develop a plan to move forward. Randy asked if a third party, like a church, is holding an event, would they still need to get a special event permit? Kevin asked Bill, whether in such a situation, would the third party be able to "piggyback" into the DORA area? Bill said he wasn't sure, but it seemed logical. Bill mentioned that there is a state hotline for inquiries about setting up a DORA. Tammy stated she wanted to bring up the subject at the next Council meeting, and also discuss with Bill next steps to move forward. Randy asked if the Chamber should come to the Village with a proposal for the DORA, or would the Village come up with their own. Tammy stated that the Chamber should come to the Village. Tammy stated that she would send out a copy of the Garrettsville paperwork to the Commission members.

New Business:

- Review Chapter 400 General Provisions Section 400.03-400.6, 410.01-410.07, 440.10
 - ❖ In 440:10 Sec. E, Tammy pointed out that this was inconsistent with parking in front of many structures, and requested that the word "shall" be removed. Steve asked if Sec. E could be removed completely. Tammy said she didn't have an objection. Kevin made motion to strike E. Tammy seconded. All voted in favor.
 - ❖ In 440.12 - Sec. A, Item 3 - Discussion on whether this is necessary, and why it might have been implemented. Discussion on Sec. A, Item 2 - should there be a distinction between businesses and residential access drives? Tammy made motion to remove Item 2. Wes seconded. All voted in favor.
 - ❖ In 440.12 - Steve brought up stipulation in Sec. A, Item 1 that driveways need to be 50 ft. from any intersection, and that didn't make sense. Kevin noted that his property, as well as several neighboring properties, don't meet this requirement. Tammy made a motion to remove first sentence from Item 1, Kevin seconded. All voted in favor.
 - ❖ Ellie asked for clarification on second sentence in Item 1. Tammy explained it was intended to prevent backups on Route 44, or another major artery.
 - ❖ Wes asked about purpose of Sec. B, and Tammy explained it was for traffic flow in & out of parking areas.
 - ❖ Members agreed to put off discussion or remaining Chapter 400 items until the next meeting.

Additional Discussions: Wes suggested we move the start time for Planning to 7PM, since we rarely started at 6:30, due to length of Safety meetings.

Steve moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:15 PM; Kevin seconded; all voted in favor.

Please note: An audio recording of this meeting is available via public record request.