

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
VILLAGE OF PENINSULA PLANNING COMMISSION**

Held: Monday, November 24, 2025

CALL TO ORDER: Ms. Walters called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Chairperson Karen Walters	Present	Greg Canda	Present
Council Rep. Doug Steidl	Present	Mayor Daniel Schneider, Jr.	Present
Kevin Royer	Present at 7:02		

OTHERS PRESENT: Village Planner Rita McMahon, Solicitor Brad Bryan, and Administrative Assistant Faith Dorton

CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES:

October 27, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting

Mr. Steidl made a motion that was seconded by Mr. Canda to approve the Minutes. Roll call vote: Ms. Walters, abstain; Mr. Canda, yes; Mayor Schneider, yes, Mr. Steidl, yes. The Minutes were approved.

CITIZENS PARTICIPATION:

Moe Riggins raised concerns about relying on park-controlled lots for shared public parking, noting that Lot 29's 123 spaces are primarily designated for the Cuyahoga River Water Trail, the Towpath Trail, and the Cuyahoga Scenic Railroad, which may limit their availability for commercial patrons. Ms. Walters shared the new Conservancy Director expressed a willingness to support parking for Peninsula but offered no concrete commitments. Mr. Canda emphasized some current parking spaces are already shared without exclusivity. Ms. Riggins stressed the need for accurate accounting of accessible public parking before applying shared parking standards to new or existing businesses to ensure long-term viability and avoid customer parking shortages. Steve Craig asked whether new property owners receive notification about their zoning district. It was suggested that the Village include that information with the welcome items distributed by the Chamber of Commerce. Questions arose about how the Chamber learns who has moved in, especially with Margo Snider retiring. It was noted that a lot of introductory information is on the Village website, and real estate agents or new owners regularly reach out to the Village with questions.

MAYOR'S REPORT: The Mayor explained that both Boston Township and the Village are down to one Service Department employee. With Mike Andexler currently on vacation. John Farmer has been covering leaf pickup in the Village. Mr. Andexler previously helped in the Township for the first two weeks of the month to keep caught up. As a result, residents may see a Boston Township truck handling Village leaf pickup this week due to the shared workload. The Village is currently accepting applications for the second Service Department employee.

COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT: Mr. Steidl reported the rezoning legislation received a second reading at the last Council Meeting.

BUSINESS:

Request from Carol J. Haramis, Trustee, to Approve Lot Split from Perm. Parcel No. 1100539, Creating New Parcel A (85.2542 acres), and the Survey/Plat Map Relating to this Lot Split.

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
VILLAGE OF PENINSULA PLANNING COMMISSION**

Held: Monday, November 24, 2025

Ms. Haramis summarized the lot split application as a request to split an approximate 112-acre parcel into an approximate 85-acre parcel and a 27-acre parcel. The 85-acre parcel is scheduled to be sold. Mr. Canda asked for clarification about the boundaries and composition of an approximately 85-acre parcel associated with a larger 112-acre property, questioning how it relates to existing parcel numbers and whether it includes the Quarry and neighboring properties. It was clarified that the parcel includes the Quarry and land west of it, extending up toward Route 303 and the backyards of properties on Major Road. Mr. Steidl and Ms. Haramis confirmed a smaller parcel off Bishop Road is part of the Haramis' property. The group identified a landlocked portion within the parcel and confirmed that certain nearby properties, including the former home of the Mitchells, are not included in the area under discussion. Ms. McMahon stated the proposal qualifies as a minor subdivision and creates two lots: one to be retained by the Haramis family and one split parcel that includes the Quarry. The lot split request fully complies with zoning and subdivision requirements for both the R-1 District and the Conservation Recreation (CR) District. She explained that the Quarry parcel being split off is entirely zoned R-1, while the remaining land, including the tree farm, remains Conservation Recreation. A small parcel with a single-family home on Bishop Road will continue as R-1 and meets all setbacks. Ms. McMahon noted only minor technical items remain before recording of the new plat could take place. Mr. Canda asked questions about the zoning district boundaries and the previously listed 85-acre parcel that is being sold, expressing concern about preventing future strip-style development. Ms. Walters offered a larger map for reference. Mr. Haramis stated they do not have permission at this time to disclose the identity of the buyer. Mr. Canda remarked that zoning the property with a Conservation/ Recreation overlay could have addressed his earlier concerns, but that zoning classification is not in place. Mr. Bryan stated that change was considered when the comprehensive zoning changes were made several years ago, but the Commission decided against it due to concerns whether such zoning restrictions would constitute a taking of private property that might result in the Village having to pay compensation to the property owner.

Mr. Steidl made a motion that was seconded by Mr. Royer to approve the lot split request with the condition that the new plat document conform with all Village requirements for items needed to be identified in the plat document. Roll call vote: Ms. Walters, abstain; Mr. Royer, yes; Mr. Canda, yes; Mayor Schneider, yes, Mr. Steidl, yes. The motion was approved.

Proposed Amendments to Village Parking Ordinance (Chapter 1125, Schedule of Off-Street Parking) and Building Footprint Limits (Chapter 1113, Schedule of Regulations, Proposed New Subsection [k])

Ms. Walters introduced proposed amendments to the Village parking regulations and asked for a summary. Ms. McMahon explained the changes aim to add flexibility to Chapter 1125 by reducing rigid minimum parking requirements in Commercial and Mixed-Use districts, which have previously discouraged development. She described a shift toward eliminating minimums for certain uses, and instead, using a shared parking model that allows the Planning Commission to evaluate parking needs based on the specific characteristics of the proposed development, rather than fixed engineering formulas for each use category. Ms. McMahon outlined a new section requiring developers to submit a shared parking analysis detailing hours of operation, parking demand, nearby uses within 500 feet, and potential overlap with surrounding businesses. The Commission would review proposals using defined criteria tied to

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
VILLAGE OF PENINSULA PLANNING COMMISSION**

Held: Monday, November 24, 2025

existing conditions, parking impacts, and consistency with the downtown Master Plan and Long-Range Plan. She also proposed limiting building footprints to fifty percent of the lot area in Commercial and Mixed-Use districts to prevent overbuilding without adequate parking. Ms. Walters asked about verification of shared parking. Ms. McMahon clarified that permission from private property owners would still be required, while Village-owned parking would remain subject to Village approval. Mr. Canda and Mr. Bryan supported the concept, noting it allows for case-by-case evaluation, rather than treating all businesses the same, while also raising concerns about over-allocation of shared parking and setting problematic precedents. Discussion focused on the proposed 500-foot shared parking radius, with Mr. Canda opposing further expansion beyond 500 feet. A distinction was made between potential, optional customer parking and parking formally counted toward the requirements. Mr. Canda suggested adding loading and unloading zones to the required analysis. Ms. McMahon agreed that should be included. Ms. Walters asked whether the Commission was ready to act on this item or wanted more time to review it.

Mr. Steidl made a motion that was seconded by Mr. Royer to recommend this code amendment to Council. Roll call vote: Ms. Walters, abstain; Mr. Royer, yes; Mr. Canda, yes; Mayor Schneider, yes, Mr. Steidl, yes. The motion was approved.

Proposed Amendments to Zoning Code Relating to Supplemental Regulations for Commercial and/or Industrial Uses Adjacent to Residential Uses: Proposed New Section 1141.42 and Pertinent Amendments to Land Use Tables, Section 1109.03

Ms. McMahon explained these revisions were made in response to prior discussions, noting that Mr. Steidl raised concerns about the previous requirement of 1.5 parking spaces per bedroom for two family and multifamily units. She stated that standard was removed and replaced with a unit-size approach. Units up to 550 square feet would require one parking space, while units over 550 square feet would require two spaces. She clarified that single-family homes still require two spaces regardless of the number of bedrooms and that accessory apartments would continue to require only one space per unit. Mr. Canda and Mr. Steidl discussed the confusion caused by the old bedroom-based formula, which could have required more than three spaces for a two-bedroom unit. They noted this revision is clearer. Daniel DeAngelo questioned whether the 550-square-foot threshold was too low, arguing that many modern one-bedroom apartments exceed that size and would require two parking spaces, potentially undermining the intent of the reform. Mr. Steidl and Mr. Royer countered that local conditions such as limited public transportation and households with two cars support requiring additional parking. Ms. McMahon acknowledged the cutoff was somewhat arbitrary but said it was tied to existing code minimums. The requirement could be adjusted by the Planning Commission if desired. Mr. Bryan noted the Code allows the Planning Commission to waive or modify criteria during the site plan review, if the intent of the parking regulations is maintained. The discussion then shifted to the scope of the amendments and related provisions. Ms. Walters asked about surface requirements for parking lots, fencing options, and how far the proposed changes extended within Chapter 1125 and related sections. Ms. McMahon clarified the amendments primarily affect Chapter 1125, with one related modification in Section 1113. Most other provisions remain unchanged. She explained that fencing was added as an alternative to plantings to address past issues and reduce the need for repeated variances. After confirming the scope of the amendments, Ms. Walters requested more time to review the full document.

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
VILLAGE OF PENINSULA PLANNING COMMISSION**

Held: Monday, November 24, 2025

Mixed-Use Zone Provision Amendments: Chapter 1116

Ms. McMahon explained she is drafting a new chapter for mixed-use developments and needs policy direction, particularly on whether the new standards should apply to all parcels in the Mixed-Use district or only those over one acre. She noted that many existing parcels are small and that strict criteria could unintentionally restrict redevelopment. Mr. Steidl argued the standards should apply to all parcels, with flexibility handled through the Planning Commission and BZA. Ms. McMahon raised broader policy questions about the purpose of the Mixed-Use district and whether it should allow single-use development on parcels or encourage multiple uses within the same building. She outlined examples ranging from retail with residential above to multiple commercial uses in one structure. She asked whether residential components should be required for all developments. Mr. Canda and Mr. Bryan pointed out practical challenges with that approach, which include small lot sizes and developers who may not want residential components. Ms. Walters questioned the compatibility of uses, such as manufacturing alongside residential. Mr. Steidl expressed concern that without clearer standards, large single-use developments could still occur under the current code. The discussion expanded to building scale, site design, and aesthetics. Ms. McMahon described potential site and design criteria, which included rear parking, façade variation, ground-floor windows, rear-loaded garages, and roof styles, to ensure new developments align with the Village’s Downtown Master Plan. Mr. Royer proposed tying required mixed uses to parcel size. Mr. Canda cautioned that requirement could deter businesses unwilling to manage multiple uses. Ms. Walters supported the site design criteria but was uncertain about mandating mixed-uses within every building. Ms. McMahon suggested an alternative incentive-based approach, where developments that include true mixed-use elements receive flexibility or bonuses. The group agreed the issues are complex and significant given the limited size and importance of the Mixed-Use area. Ms. Walters concluded that more discussion is needed on this issue, alongside a careful review of the Master Plan.


The Mayor made a motion that was seconded by Mr. Canda to cancel the December Planning Commission Meeting. Roll call vote: Ms. Walters, yes; Mr. Royer, yes; Mr. Canda, yes; Mayor Schneider, yes, Mr. Steidl, yes. The motion was approved.

ADJOURNMENT: Mr. Canda made a motion that was seconded by Ms. Walters to adjourn the meeting. Roll call vote: Ms. Walters, yes; Mr. Royer, yes; Mr. Canda, yes; Mayor Schneider, yes, Mr. Steidl, yes. The meeting was adjourned at 8:41 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Karen Walters, Chairperson

Date



2/20/26