

**Eastlake City Council
Ordinance Committee Meeting
December 9, 2025
6:00 p.m.**

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

Meeting called to order by Chairman Gulley at approximately 6:01 p.m. All members of Council present as well as Law Director Klammer, Mayor Overstreet, Police Chief Werner, and CBO Menn.

He states the only item on the agenda is the discussion of rezoning of a property on Erie Road to be rezoning from Industrial to Residential Family.

Joe Grcar, the property owner, comes to speak to Council. He states he feels it would be more beneficial for the City to have condos instead of an Industrial building. He is proposing roughly 30 units. He does have an interested party for a commercial building. He wants to be clear, regardless of what is built on the property, the trees will be removed. They would be nice units around a \$350,000 price range. The City would not be responsible for snow removal or street maintenance.

Ms. Krajnyak asks him to explain how tall the structures are.

He says he has some renderings that he has been working on. 9' walls first floor, 8' on second floor. No ugly three stories. 6 pitch roof to keep things down and lower.

Krajnyak asks if it will still be built on top of a garage.

He estimates 24' tall approximately.

She says 38-32 units? What about a fence around the back. There are several people here with properties backing up to it. Would you be interested in a fence to block noise and light?

He says possibly. It could be discussed based on dimensions.

She says her concern is how close the buildings are to the actual property. She wants to be respectful for what he's doing with it, but whenever you change the zoning, she wants to be mindful of their feelings as well.

He says if he does commercial it is probably close to property line too. Mason wall.

She says there's a difference between that and 30 families cars and such there. She asks Klammer if the Charter says they need to notify residents if this goes through?

He says that it would be residents within 300'.

She says Planning bounced it back to us, but we are supposed to be going through with something?

Meyers says there is nothing to be voted on. This is just for us to decide if we wish to move it forward and then legislation would be proposed.

Klammer says you do still have the ability to send it back to Planning. It has to go to Council regardless. This is a good time for further questions. You can motion tonight to send it back.

Menn says the thought that if this person doesn't build as residential but say someone came along in 2 months and wanted to build residential, they just want to get the property labeled. Once that is decided, it has to go back to Planning again with all the drawings and that's when they can clarify all the specifications on fencing and colors. At this point, we are trying to decide if that lot will stay M1 or RMF. Whether Mr. Grcar does it or someone else.

Krajnyak asks if that is considered a flood plain?

Grcar says no.

Klammer says he has made proposals because we ask for them, but he is not bound by them. He is bound by the Ordinances.

Krajnyak says the risk is what she's concerned about. She doesn't like not knowing and voting to change the zoning.

Meyers asks Grcar if these are the same plans that were initially brought forward to Planning?

Grcar says yes. This is not finalized, just a starting point. He is happy to work with the City to ensure everyone is happy.

Meyers says he would think that having a manufacturing facility there that may not be positive. You would be dealing with lighting, trucks, odors, etc.

Kasunick says he was wondering if he could clarify what type of business would come in? Would it cause traffic or pollution problems? Would it create jobs.

Menn says it is light industrial.

Kasunick says he thought he had a business in mind.

Grcar says the person interested has a machine shop and landscaping business.

Meyers says possibly meeting with Residents... have you considered possibly amending the plans? Some residents had concerns about condos and the heights? Have you thought about single family homes?

Grcar says there is not enough room. The numbers don't work. He has the plans if anyone wants to look at them.

Krajnyak asks how long he has owned the property?

Grcar says about a month.

She says when did you start this process?

He said about 6 months ago. He has an agreement with the seller.

She asks who is the seller? She says it is public record.

Grcar says Mario Gianni.

Gulley invites Grcar to return to his seat. He asks Council if they have more questions.

Semick says it is strictly rezoning that we are talking about right? Planning would still have to approve everything?

Krajnyak says when there is a residential change, most cities require a Charter change. Eastlake changed that many years ago. Mentor is a hybrid which still requires residential to go to the people.

Mr. Gulley opens the floor to recognition of the public.

Robert, an Eastlake resident, comes to address Council. He refers to Ordinance 1165.02 and asks if that is the one Krajnyak was referring to that gives Council the right to change the zoning.

She says yes that is the one.

Robert says there are stipulations in the Ordinance. Which one does this fall under?

Klammer says this could be considered bad zoning to have an industrial in the middle of all the residential.

Robert says he feels this is a threat. He feels it is an idle threat. He says Grcar has lied multiple times already. He has been here twice so far and doesn't understand why he is not being notified by the City that these actions are taking place. And at what time are we going to get Council minutes posted on the website? And planning minutes? This is a problem. Where are we in this process? Are we getting the 30 day notice before Planning decides if they want to change this?

Meyers says where we are in the process is just determining tonight if we want to move this forward or not. If they decide to move it forward, it would not occur tonight.

Robert says everything done at this point is just spinning wheels then. He was here in August. Either way, one way or another this needs done the right way.

Klammer says it goes to Planning. They rejected it. It should have been forwarded to Council even with the rejection. He doesn't know why that was. When Mr. Grcar raised the issue to bring it to Council, it needed to be discussed before Council decides to move forward. Ordinance Committee can send it back to Planning for review or they can decide to move it forward to Council for a vote. In a sense, the more hearings we have the better to hear from residents about it. He clarifies that if this goes back to Planning, a 30 day notice will go out.

Doug, an Eastlake resident, says he does infrastructure work for utilities. There are plenty of opportunities for industrial buildings elsewhere. He backs up to this particular property. Does he have the same option to tear down his house and build a 3-4 family unit? His HOA, what if it goes bankrupt? You see that a lot. That can fall back on the City. If you're going to go forward with it, he wants to know if he will be given the same opportunity. He understands if someone wants to do something with their property. Only putting in 8-10 houses is apparently not economically feasible. He asks Council to consider if it's their own backyard or their house. He can give you a list as long as his arm for places that need industrial.

Heather Freeman, an Eastlake resident, says there were concerns raised about the process and notification process. The Ordinance state that for rezoning for Planning you have to notify the other 42

properties. She received the records from Karin that the records were not sent certified mail. It was clear from reading the Planning Commission minutes that this was not clear. The legal notice said they were not even considering the rezoning. Looking at the map right now, effective as of 2008, which does not include the rezoning for Washington of 332. It shows that Garrets Cove is zoned R75. Dimilta is RMF residential multi family. She heard from the minutes that he was talking about 32 units. According to the development it requires 5 acres. He doesn't even have that, he only has roughly 3 acres. That is like 14-15 units max then. His proposed plan is more than double. Multiple variances would be required. She gets it, we aren't reviewing the site plan, but what he is presenting is not complaint. In her opinion, M1 might actually protect these residents a bit more. M1 says 100' away from a property line. Parking can be 20' away and requires landscaping. Also no more than 30% of the lot can be covered in buildings. She isn't sure if the residents understand that. It is interesting with the zoning map already, you have a lot of different districts going on. Maybe R75 which is more similar to the surrounding properties. Would be a similar density.

No one else wishes to speak. Mr. Gulley asks if Council has any additional comments or questions?

Krajnyak says to Heather's point, in regards to a smaller building back there... when she walked the property and met with the Chief, literally the building was on top of his property. It was mind boggling to her how anyone would want to live there with that in their back yard. As far as M1 she feels a light industrial with all those specifications is not a negative thing.

Mr. Gulley says the question before us is do we want to move it forward to be rezoned at the next Council Meeting or send it back to Planning?

Mr. Kasunick says Planning already rejected it. Why would it be different if we sent it back to them?

Klammer says Planning may be interested in hearing any changes and also making sure correct notice goes out.

Kasunick says if there was a rezone, would it go 3 readings? Would that be subject to the referendum that if the residents are opposed they can circulate a petition?

Meyers says the other issue is that it would pass as an emergency or would have to be on next year because we cannot carry things over from year to year. So would be middle of February.

Krajnyak says if it doesn't go back to Planning and it does go just to Council, there's no 30 day notification? Does that only happen if it goes back to Planning.

Klammer says there's nothing stopping them from doing that. Council can set a public hearing and do notice to the residents. The applicant would pay for the certified mail. Sending it back to Planning now is okay because their terms don't expire.

Semick says moving it back to Planning is the best choice. That way the process is done correctly and then 3 readings for Council.

Ms. Schmidt motions to move it back to Planning and Ms. Kostlenik second.

It will be moved back to Planning Commission.

Adjourned 6:36 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT

This meeting was adjourned at 6:36 p.m.

JOHN MEYERS, COUNCIL PRESIDENT

APPROVED: 12/23/25

ATTEST: Alyssa Moran

ALYSSA MORAN, CLERK OF COUNCIL