CONCORD TOWNSHIP ZONING COMMISSION LAKE COUNTY, OHIO PUBLIC HEARING and REGULAR MEETING

Concord Town Hall 7229 Ravenna Road Concord, Ohio 44077

August 1, 2017 7:00 p.m.

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Zoning Commission members present:

Andy Lingenfelter, Chairman Morgan McIntosh, Vice Chairman Gerard Morgan Frank Schindler Rich Peterson

Also Present:

Heather Freeman, Planning & Zoning Director/Zoning
 Inspector
Sydney Martis, Planner/Assistant Zoning Inspector
Michael Lucas, Esq., Legal Counsel

Melton Reporting
11668 Girdled Road
Concord, Ohio 44077
(440) 946-1350

7:00 p.m.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Good evening, everyone. I would like to call this public hearing or -- I am sorry -- the Concord Zoning Commission meeting, Tuesday, August 1st, to order. We have a fairly lengthy agenda with a public hearing this evening, a number of amendments that need to be gone through. And, first, what I would like to do is kind of read through what amendments we are going to be considering this evening and how, what the process flow is going to be for tonight.

The public hearing for the following amendments:

Amendment Number 1 is to amend the Zoning Resolution to establish the Innovative Site/PD Overlay District as a planned development in Section 21, and delete in its entirety Section 13.36, Innovative Site/PD as a conditional use in the Capital District.

Amendment Number 2 is to amend the Zoning Map to rezone the following presently designated parcel numbers to the Innovative Site/PD District, and they are listed in the agenda and they will be further described in Exhibit A.

Amendment Number 3 will be to revise Section 5.02 to include new definitions for terms related to parking and revise others.

Amendment Number 4 will revise Section 11.01 to require zoning permits for porches, and retaining walls that require a permit from the Building Department. Revise to include reorganization of the existing sections and headings.

Amendment Number 5 will be to revise Sections 13.07, 13.08, 13.11, 30.12, 13.16 to reference compliance with all parking regulations in Section 29. Revise Sections 13.17,

13.25, 13.26, and 13.28 for compliance with the waiting space requirements in Section 29.

Amendment Number 6 will be to revise Section 15.03(I) to require all residential districts comply with the parking regulations in Section 29. Modify Section 15.05 to clarify that minimum "residential" floor area and enclosed parking requirements are set forth in Table 15.05-1, and enclosed -- unenclosed off-street parking is regulated in Section 29.

Amendment Number 7, to revise Section 16.07(C) to reference Section 13 for a conditional use permit for a commercial center, and site plan review is required for a commercial center. Modify Section 16.08 and 16.09 to require a commercial center in a PUD to meet the requirements of Section 29 Off-Street Parking. Revise zoning permit process in Section 16.15 to reference Section 11. Clarify Section 16.16 for minor or major modifications to an approve development plan. Revise 16.24(C)(4) to require a landscape plan to be submitted for any open space area disturbed during construction.

Amendment Number 8, revise Section 22.03 to remove drive-thru facilities, Innovative Site/PD, Townhouses and Live/Work Units as conditional uses within the Capital District. Revise Section 22.09 to include regulations for maintenance of unimproved areas, watercourses and stormwater facilities. Delete Section 22.10 Capital District standards.

Amendment Number 9, revise Section 29.01 to add new purpose statements related to green infrastructure and reducing impervious surfaces in parking areas. Revise Sections 29.02 Applicability, 29.03 General Standards, 29.04 Off-Street Parking Requirements, 29.05 Alternative Parking Options,

29.06 Parking Lot Design Standards, 29.07 Parking Lot Access Drive Regulations, 29.08 Bicycle Parking and Waiting Space Requirements.

Amendment Number 10, revise Section 34.02 to require all properties not agriculturally exempt to obtain a zoning permit for construction of fences.

Amendment Number 11, revise Section 36.03 to require all site plans to be reviewed by the Zoning Commission. Revise Section 30.04 -- 36.04 to require plan items to be submitted. New Section 36.09, Significance of an Improved Final Site Plan. Revise 36.11 to add new standards for minor and major modifications.

Amendment Number 12, revise Section 37 to include references to the IS/PD Overlay District, include new Section 37.06 Pedestrian Facilities and Section 37.07 Maximum Setback and Wall Orientation for "Concord Circle" Frontages.

And, finally, Amendment Number 13, revise 38.02 Applicability, Section 38.03 General Requirements, Section 38.05 Interior Parking Lot Guidelines, and other sections to reference the IS/PD Overlay District.

So, as you can see, we've got a lot to cover.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: We can read, too.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. With that said, I would like to open the public hearing. And I would like to introduce Heather Freeman, if she would like to come up and introduce the consultants, that's Risinger and Associates. They are here to put on a presentation for the Board. And, Heather, go ahead and do the introduction for us.

MS. FREEMAN: Good evening. I just wanted to take this opportunity to welcome back, we have this evening with us

Ben Fierman, Eric Risinger, and Barb Dickson, with Risinger and Associates. I know they've attended a couple special meetings that we've had with the Board, so this is not the first time that you've had conversations with them. But I thought this would be a great opportunity to invite them back to give a presentation that will help reinforce some of the basic planning principles that went behind designing the Town Center concept, and those are concepts that the proposed zoning language is based upon.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Please state your name and your address for the record when you speak. Thank you.

MR. RISINGER: Good evening. Eric Risinger, with Risinger and Associates. We're at 1032 West Fulton Market in Chicago, Illinois.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Hold on a second. Excuse me, sir, sir, sir.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I just want to tell you we can't hear anything back here.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: There is no, there is no loud speaker system in here, sir. You are going to have to pay attention.

MR. PATTERSON: He can speak a little louder, Andy.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Well, he can speak, if he is able to do that, he can do that. All right. Okay, go ahead.

MR. RISINGER: Okay. And I am here with Barb Dickson, who is with our firm as well, with Risinger and Associates, and Dr. Fierman. And what we would like to do is we're going to walk you through the planning principles that form the overall planning and recommendations that we have made. In addition to that, we will be referencing certain

elements of the Comprehensive Plan and areas where we felt were influential so that we can come back and really summarize our previous meetings that we've had with the Zoning Commission. So thank you for having us back.

So, Barb, let's go to the next slide.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Nobody back here can see anything.

MR. PATTERSON: Nothing to see.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: At least, close the door.

MR. RISINGER: So 2004, the Comprehensive Plan outlined a series of recommendations, and this Comprehensive Plan was made up of the Concord Township's Citizens Advisory Committee. And some of the elements that are highlighted here explain the basis of what our conversations led to in terms of planning and recommendations for the new -- for the Town Center.

And so just to reiterate here, on Item 2, to provide for a limited amount of smaller-scale cluster, attached and senior housing in areas served by sewer/water services that are conveniently located to retail, transportation and other support services. At the bottom of the page, you will see additional recommendations in terms of mixed-use centers, areas where the township would like to provide housing options that support the goal of providing a community town center or other mixed-use options.

And these elements are important because they continue to evolve. And you will see in our timeline, which is on the subsequent slide, is this starts to talk about where this all began. So 2002-2004 is when the Comprehensive Plan update project began. And within that process, obviously, the, the statement up here, but I will just repeat it a little bit

here, is the Citizens Advisory Committee was formed, the survey and public hearings were had, and policy direction and recommendations were put forth. And, again, just -- this is isn't coming out of thin air. We aren't trying to take something in different direction. We are really trying to bring good planning principles forward.

In 2006, you have the Auburn-Crile Business Corridor Study that was completed, and in that, it includes the new development, the BX, the RD-2 Districts, targets for more aggressive marketing and development, and a town center concept recommendation.

And then in 2008, the Concord-Painesville JEDD was created, so the Joint Economic Development District, 2008, again, helping serve as a continued catalyst for economic development within Concord Township.

So 2011 through 2016, it kind of, in this, in this process was the Auburn-Crile Road Connector Improvement Project. And in that project there was forecast of about 20 years in terms of how the traffic was going to be handled, what they were forecasting in the road improvements. So that was contemplated back in 2011, obviously, being implemented and completed recently.

In 2014, the Economic Development Joint Committee, with the JEDD and Township, City of Painesville, to create and purchase then the Concord Township land purchase. Now, that was through the JEDD and not through specifically the township.

In 2014-2015, that's when we began the project planning update, public hearings, recommended zoning changes, and at that time a Town Center RFP was issued. So that is an important milestone. That is not the RFP that we have issued.

That was one that was prior to our efforts here. And part of the feedback that was understood and part of the analysis that the groups went through was to understand, why was there a lack of response? What was not coming forward? And part of that had to do with not understanding what the overall vision was and wanting to really have a comprehensive view of what this might be and what it could be. And at the same time, you had the road project which was from Crile cutting across 44 that was in the works and then under construction but not yet completed. And so having that completed was an important aspect of the original RFP.

In 2015, the strategy planning meeting leading into the Concord Town Center Master Plan project. And so, essentially, going back to looking at, critically, elements that were successful, elements that weren't successful, and looking at how the Concord 2004 Comprehensive Plan, 2015 Plan can still be evolved and moved forward.

And then here we are, 2017, for the Zoning Resolution updates.

So the Fair Housing Act covers most housing. And I know some of the discussions have been about, what are we looking at? What are we trying to provide here? What are we intending to do? Obviously, any development that occurs within Concord Township, with any community, needs to meet all the applicable codes for the jurisdictions having authority.

So the notion that the Fair Housing is not going to be complied with is certainly not at all intended, and more importantly, will be the responsibility of any developer coming in. But also within the zoning, that is expected and anticipated. So in terms of buildings that are ready for

occupancy after March 31st, they must have public and common areas that are accessible to persons with disabilities, absolutely. Doors and hallways must be wide enough for wheelchairs. All units must have accessible routes into and through unit, accessible light switches, reinforced bathroom walls that allow for installation of grab bars, so all of these things that are a part of the Americans with Disability Act, as well as any other code that local governing authorities might have put in place that add more restrictions.

So part of what we wanted to make sure that we were bringing forth for your reference was, what is a town center and what is good planning? So mixed-use development is a real estate project that is essentially planned with the integration of accommodation of retail, of office, hotel, recreation, other functions. It is a -- It is intended to provide for a pedestrian-oriented development, something that, quite honestly, rarely exists in Concord Township today. So there are very few developments that are walkable without being in your automobile. And then, lastly, it maximizes space usage.

And so one of the things that is important here when you look at the expression "and tends to mitigate traffic and sprawl," when developments are encouraged to be single story, what they end up doing is they're actually taking up a huge amount of land mass. And so you have urban sprawl, you will have multiple expressions of long, deep buildings, and we have other examples that we will be able to show the Commission.

So what is the difference between a lifestyle center and a town center? And this is something that, with our clients, we certainly go through and we talk about those expressions because those are important to really understand.

And so the lifestyle center is really comprised of an upscale national chain which is serving as an anchor and then stores with dining and entertainment that are built around that. But it is solely dependent upon a single anchor coming in and serving as the catalyst for that development.

Town center is an enduring, walkable and integrated open-air multi-use development. So it is organized by identifiable and energized public realms and it is intended to provide a long-term, good planning solution that is built over time, certainly not -- we are not expecting it to literally pop up overnight, but good town planning principles that are brought in. So right now Crile Road, the retail along Crile Road is traditional strip center, more lifestyle center, certainly not town center oriented.

So looking at traditional neighborhood developments, what we wanted to make sure that we were doing is really rooting both the advice, the direction, the nuances that we talked about in the zoning. And when you look at a traditional neighborhood development or a village-style development or a town center, it includes a variety of housing types.

Essentially, this, this use creates activity both in providing for retail, mixed use on the housing and on commercial districts.

So our goal in going through the development and going through the process of understanding how do we enhance this, how do we further define what Concord Township is looking to do, it is to make sure that we're providing that right mix so that the commercial district is vibrant and strong, so the commercial district has an opportunity to be successful, that it's not solely dependent upon one tenant, one user, because

what you do see out there is, when you have a lifestyle center and that major tenant moves out, then you are at the risk of the other tenants then starting to fold in with that.

So a TND is a complex undertaking and most developers would chose a more familiar, less risky sprawl model. And, of course, Concord came back to us and said, "That's not what we're looking for. We're looking for the right planning development. We are looking for one that is for the long term.

So, generally, if these are implemented in a wholistic manner, which, again, is what the plan represents, it is not intended to be something where it's just one piece that's solely developed in spite of other elements to this. It's to create an opportunity where you have a complementary development and you have a solution that is completion but viable and works.

So what's the rationale for this? And, right now, you cannot walk from one side of Concord to another side of Concord Township, 44 is a barrier. And putting in the Capital Parkway and extending and coming across over off of Crile has been a significant improvement.

In addition to this, what we're looking to do is to seek where we have a low density, you know, seek to get away from this low density, auto-oriented development and look at solutions that are pedestrian friendly, that are walkable, that are sustainable, that have open lands, that preserve open space, address parking needs. All of those items are addressed in the, in the current zoning as well as some of the zoning amendments that we are proposing.

So good sustainability practices. So, again, our goal here was to make sure that we're helping identify how to

create and generate economic growth. How can we create a proper diversity of that economic growth so that we are seeing it sustained over years and over time and not susceptible significantly to some mark in patterns and in danger of taking out what is being put in. So using existing infrastructure, encouraging clustering. Again, when you look at density and you look at the opportunity to have this overall development, when you look at the proposed plan and you look at the overall density, it's low and it's also comparable to what other developments have out there that are very successful.

The benefits of a traditional neighborhood development is we finally get a walkable neighborhood. when we have studied the community and you look through the community elements, there are very few sidewalks to walk on. If you are in a neighborhood, generally, you are walking in the street if you are going from Point A to Point B, and generally it's automobile based. So we are looking to bring walkable communities by allowing mixtures of uses, encouraging transportation mode options, protect open space. You will see in our proposed solution is the riparian corridor and the wetlands that might exist on the site, to have an opportunity to solve that stormwater now and not wait for somebody else to not understand it and make sure that we are acknowledging it; create communities designed for live, work and play. And then, lastly, reduce vehicle congestion by having the opportunity where you can be in a development and walk to that place that -- or ride your bicycle to that place that you would like to go to.

So risks, not taking into account all the elements can lead to developments that fail to certainly meet

expectations.

So NAIOP, the National Association of Industrial Office Properties, certainly, that association spends every year studying and looking at and having staff that evaluates what can we capitalize on synergies for these types of developments, and what they're talking about is make sure that each use is significant to the level of the market demands.

So, again, the plan that we have is purely a graphic gesture of what could be allowed by the zoning. It is not dictating and saying that that is the solution. Certainly, our graphic representation is not what you're implementing. You're implementing the zoning amendments. And it is to give you a benchmark so you can understand what the possibilities are.

Then when future developers come to you, you have a benchmark by which you can measure that.

Barb, let's go to the next slide.

So the principles for developing successful town centers is looking at enduring and memorable public realms. You will see in the plan we propose a market square. This is gazebo where we would envision the opportunity to have farmers markets, to have art fairs, to gather the public, to again give an amenity back to the community and, at the same time, make sure that the retailers and the commercial district can be successful in having a place that people want to go to, having a place that people can drive to and walk around and feel that they want to spend time.

So we are looking at, in our plans, balancing the flexibility with the long-term vision. We're looking at providing integrated multiple uses. We're looking at a connection to the community, and we are asking for the zoning

to encourage that investment in the community.

So in terms of, you will hear the term, and you will probably hear it more in current planning principles, but the "place making" term, the idea that you are providing a place where people want to spend time. It is what is driving developments. Lifestyle centers are trying to be, kind of, that quasi place-making element, as well as trying to be the retail place. We're saying, yes, in the Town Center, you can have both of that.

And so we're looking at providing multiple living and work places, retail, and creating an opportunity where developers can come in and know that this mixed-use development can be thriving, can be living, and provides an environment that people are looking for, again, looking for that long-term development phase in the planning that we have submitted in front of you guys.

So through all of this, the Concord Township, the JEDD has created this vision statement of developing a destination town center that reflects Concord Township. In addition to that, the goals are: Create walkable, bikable access to and from the Town Center. This is important. The market is asking for this. The market wants this. But, more importantly, it's good sustainable practices that start to reduce the reliability on automobile, provide residential living within the Town Center to attract and retain growing populations. And in addition to that, then the growing residential will help and, and support the commercial, office and mixed-use development.

So this slide is starting to represent those items that are both currently in your zoning and items that we're

also looking at amending. And what we -- This is the area of the plan that is the mixed-use development. So on this plan, you are seeing the proposed gazebo, again, for that place-making element for the public to gather, for the opportunity to have those public functions that, you know, concerts on the lawn on summer Tuesday night, having the art fair, having the farmers market, again, creating that gathering place-making spaces.

And then within this just, again, a graphic representation within the zoning is to say ground floor could be retail. The upper floors could be either office or a mixed use. And, at the same time, what we're, what we're representing are the standards for the parking for both giving an opportunity for on-street parking, as well as we have a proposed deck underneath this area for off-street parking as well.

So in this plan, what we are talking about is the mixed use is represented by the yellow color coding. We are showing additional mixed-use office as well within the blue and then, obviously, transitioning down into residential in the RD-2 District as an overlay. And we will come back to this and talk about this a little bit further.

So one of the things that we wanted to make sure that we are really based upon and understanding is some of the myths and facts that past clients have talked with us about, have been concerned about, and making sure that we are addressing those items. So the American Institute of Architects, the National Multifamily Housing Council, Sierra Club, Urban Land Institute, this is a joint paper that they had published, and this is a good overview based upon these

organizations putting together their data and their research.

So myth is higher-density development overburdens public schools and other public services and requires more infrastructure support systems. The fact: The nature of who lives in higher-density housing -- and, again, higher density is all relative. So I will give you a for example. If you had a parcel that was one and got split into four, for your neighbors that would be considered higher density. So higher density is all relative. The density that we've been talking about throughout the planning process and that we have shown you is all within a -- within the context of case studies that we have presented and you are, you are not exceeding any of those numbers, and we will speak to those specifically.

So fewer families with children puts less demand on schools, public services than low-density housing. And, moreover, the compact nature of higher-density development requires less extensive infrastructure to support it.

Myth Number 2 and Fact 2: Higher density development lowers property values in surrounding areas. Fact: No discernible difference exists in the appreciation rate of properties located near higher-density development and those that are not. Some research has even shown that higher-density development can increase property values.

What's important about this development is that it's truly not adjacent to any other development that is in this corridor. So, again, we are looking to speak specifically towards the idea of allowing the residential, which is currently allowed in the current zoning in the Capital District, to be part of the overall fabric of the solution.

Myth 3: Higher-density development creates more

regional traffic congestion and parking problems than low-density development. Higher -- Fact: Higher-density generates less traffic than low-density development per unit; it makes walking and public transit more feasible and creates opportunities for shared parking.

Again, what we're starting to talk about is that cross traffic. What happens when -- if there are people in that development? They can walk to it. Right now, you cannot walk to anything in Concord. As a matter of fact, walking from anyplace that is, essentially, east of 44 to go west is not feasible. You have to drive.

Higher-density development leads to higher crime rates. Fact: The crime rates of higher-density developments are not significantly different from those at lower-density developments.

Myth 5: Higher-density development is environmentally more destructive than lower-density development. The fact is low-density development increases air and water pollution. Again, that goes back to the sprawl that we were talking about. It destroys natural areas by paving and urbanizing greater swaths of land. In our, in our proposed plan, suggestion is to show how you can have the open land space with the development with mix used and create a cohesive blend that, frankly, the market is asking for.

Myth 6: Higher-density development is unattractive and does not fit in a low-density community. Fact:
Attractive, well-designed and well-maintained higher-density developments attract good residents and tenants and fits into existing communities. And, again, this area within Concord Township is a very small fraction of the overall land

development that is available and this is a community that will be driven by the market. There is a -- The goal of having the commercial blend with the residential will start to dictate what the developer can do and what they're going to put out there as a product. Again, they're the ones taking the risk. You're not developing this. That's not what we are proposing.

MR. PATTERSON: They already --

MR. RISINGER: Myth 7: No one in suburban areas wants higher-density development. Fact: The population is changing and becoming increasingly diverse. Many of these households now prefer higher-density housing even in suburban locations.

Eight: Higher-density housing is only for lower income households. Fact: People of all income groups choose higher-density housing, and we have examples that we can certainly show.

So looking at the planning drivers and going into the data sets -- And, again, these aren't data sets that we're inventing, these data sets that are sitting out there. So looking at the Wharton School, Business School, "The Return of the Town Center," there's a really interesting article written about the return of that and it is as much about congregating as it is much about merchandising, that indeed when you provide that in your planning solution, that mix of place-making and opportunity for people to gather, you actually are providing the support for the commercial district.

In the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City, "The Demographic Shift From Single-Family to Multi-Family Housing," it will put downward pressure on single-family relative to multi-family housing places -- prices, exactly. What's

happening is the shifting of the consumer demand away from goods and services complements large indoor space and a backyard towards goods and services more oriented towards living in a multi-family setting.

And then looking at Curbed Millennials will beg

And then looking at *Curbed*, Millennials will begin to form households in masses, millions of baby boomers will retire, seek out multi-generation -- generational neighborhoods and will continue to evolve and grow.

And, again, part of the 2004 Comprehensive Plan talked about the fact that Concord, over time, will need to be addressing the different housing types and looking at making sure that they're understanding what the demographic shifts are at and making sure that we are providing for that.

So on this, on this graph here, this is by the Urban Land Institute talking about where people are living and how are they living. Thirty-eight percent of Gen Y expects to live in multi-family housing by 2020.

Go to the next slide.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Could you repeat that?

MR. PATTERSON: Yeah, that's a real good quote.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thirty percent of what?

MR. RISINGER: Thirty-eight percent of Gen Y'ers

expect to live in multi-family housing.

MR. PATTERSON: Of what, Gen Y?

MR. RISINGER: Yes.

MR. PATTERSON: What's a Gen Y?

MR. RISINGER: Generation Y.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Oh, Generation Y.

MR. PATTERSON: Generation Y, who's that?

MR. RISINGER: It's a mix with your millennials and

those that are not quite the baby boomers with the Gen X. 1 AUDIENCE MEMBER: How old are they? 2 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah, what age? 3 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Excuse me, folks. We're not 4 going to start with the cross-examination. This presentation 5 is for our benefit, not for yours. 6 AUDIENCE MEMBER: We want to understand. 7 8 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: We will expect order. 9 AUDIENCE MEMBER: No. We just --CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: We will expect order. 10 There is no cross-examination this evening. He will give his 11 presentation. This is for the Board. Thank you. 12 13 Go ahead. MR. PATTERSON: Don't you have any questions, Andy? 14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: But we are the residents. We --15 MR. RISINGER: So looking at the planning drivers 16 again and then trying to understand the housing trends for 17 empty-nesters, the empty-nesters are looking for multi-family, 18 low/no maintenance living and, obviously, looking for something 19 that is accessible. So the, the -- If you look at the Chicago 20 21 Tribune as an example, which is talking about a national report 22 by Jeffrey Steele, many empty-nesters desire to relocate to 23 smaller, maintenance-free homes with higher-quality finishes 24 and amenities, values quality in the detail of a home with 25 energy efficiency and flexible living spaces driving the trend. 26 Look at Crain's "Retired, but opting to stay in the 27 'burbs," and one of the demographic trends that we are seeing 28 is that, in this part of northeast Ohio, is providing that 29 stepdown housing, the opportunity for that person to be able to

not have to leave their community but, perhaps, sell their

30

single-family home and moving into a multi-family option that can accommodate them and offer that maintenance-free living.

And, again, whether that is a vertical multi-family or horizontal, we are not making that statement here right now.

So what we wanted to do is to start to show you the basis in some of the points of examples that are actually planning and then subsequently built. So what you are seeing on the left is the Concord Town Center, one of the options for the housing and townhome residential. And what you're seeing in the middle is an example of the density that has been translated into the image that you see here on the right.

So what you are looking at is two- and three-story expressions of the residential component. You are seeing what happens when that plan then translates to the, to the residential picture. And, again, the basis of our planning efforts was to make sure that we're maintaining what is, essentially, Concord and make sure that we're accommodating the culture and the identity that we believe is important to Concord Township.

So this is another example in terms of translating that multi-family product into the built product. So this is a development that was a former naval air base that the community market demands which were looking for the attached townhome. So these all have living on -- and master bedrooms all on the ground floor. There is a den and guest room option on the upper floors. But this is all appeal to both young families as well as to people, seniors that are stepping down in their housing.

Barb, can you go back to that real quick?
So what you're looking at here is 18 dwelling units

per acre in this, in this plan which is matching the -- over here. Okay.

This is a development that starts to represent what a commercial mixed-use development might look like. On the ground floor, you have professional offices, you will have dental offices, you have an accounting firm, et cetera. On the upper three floors in this scenario, you have terraces, you have condominiums up above. Their square footages range from 1,800 square feet to 2,400 square feet. This, this building is in very, very high demand and that is an 8 -- this building represents an 18-unit, dwelling unit per acre.

And then, lastly, one of the examples we wanted to show you was, again, trying to translate some of the planning principles, you can start to see here the option for both these duplexes, single-family, as well as the multi-family, and then the translation into what that starts to look like as far as a multi-family scenario. Again, market demanding a liveable, walkable community, scale architecture all appropriate to meet those demands.

Another example within the mixed-use development corridor is here looking at First and Main in Hudson, again, translating what that multi and -- story and mixed-use development might look like, again, retail ground floor in this case, it might be offices up above, again, all with which are planned into the solution that we're representing that are allowed by the code.

And then we wanted to start to show, when you have a combination of both retail centric as well as residential, so this building is actually this building here that you see on the right. But what's unique about it is what they've done is

it's all ground floor retail and then it is, up above, it is a residential unit. Some of them actually are two-story above that as well. So it gives them an option. It's almost like a townhome on top of the retail and, at the same time, overlooking the open lands that the developer wanted to create which was part of the attractiveness of this overall development.

And then for reference, just to continue to look at what we have proposed, what you are looking at in the amendments is the opportunity to create that liveable, walkable community, wide sidewalks, carriage path, signage, trees, safe crossing zones, parking that's controlled within the configuration of the curb line and, again, how that might look if it were completed and built.

So this starts to, again, go back to the basis of our conversation. Again, what does the opportunity hold and what might it look like for Concord Township? So we are looking down Auburn and Capital Parkway is here and we are getting a bird's-eye view of the commercial mixed-use zone that we have talked about.

Again, what we're -- what we have talked about and wanted to start to visualize so we could benchmark for yourselves and for others is to understand that we're looking at a community that is to be attractive for people to, obviously, want to spend time in, for retailers to want to come in here and participate in this, in this development.

Certainly, there are opportunities to -- for citizens to come in and residents to experience the market area, to open this up, to envision maybe cafe dining out here, to participate in the retail, smaller shops that might be part of this, this

solution.

What we are not driving here is we're certainly not looking for that big box retail. We're not looking for a retailer to come here, single-story, and suddenly have a field parking of 1,500 spaces and driving out the overall concept of this mixed-use development. And this is another view again now looking down Capital Parkway towards the -- one of the multifamily buildings here in the distance and then starting to lead in towards the townhomes.

Now, in the background here, what you start to see is the Ellison Creek Preserve, and one of the things that we wanted to do is to acknowledge what is there, what is natural by nature and to make that into an amenity. So what, again, what we are saying might be, a developer might start to look at is, perhaps, a walking or jogging track around the open green field space, to talk about an opportunity for an amphitheater out there. Again, we're not expecting the present company to pay for that. We are just suggesting what might be good community amenities and we're talking about gathering and being communal.

Now, the other thing that we are talking about is also the opportunity that there might be an area to walk out onto a dock and experience that wetland and also the opportunity to walk this entire community.

Next area. So the Gateway into this area, so here we are on Auburn and we are looking south and we are heading down and, on both sides, you can see the scale and the factor of these, of these three-story buildings.

So, again, finishing up and looking at the plan here, we are looking at views and the mixed use commercial area, we

are looking at views down Capital Parkway towards the residential, as well as then looking across here at the market square as well as the detention/retention pond.

So in terms of the overlay district, what we are, what we are talking about is the opportunity, within the overlay district, to allow the residential component to be part of the fabric that a developer may choose to engage in. Again, the, under zoning, the RD-2, as well as the current Capital District is not changing. We are not rezoning. We're asking for an additional use to be added to that, to the RD-2 District. That residential use, under conditional, is allowed currently in the Capital District. We are not looking to change that, we are looking to enhance that.

One of the elements that I thought was a compelling story just to start to look at is when we talk about, well, who would want to live here, why would they want to live here, it's the, the, all of the red zones represent automobile access only, nonwalkable roadways. And we can certainly debate the yellow zones here but, again, it's not a -- there's no sidewalks. There is nothing for the pedestrian on those, on those areas.

So why this development? This development, again, with the zoning amendments, is looking at having the sidewalks, having a liveable, walkable community, trying to reduce the congestion of the automobile traffic and really provide a sustainable development that will be well received in the marketplace and drive a very pleasant and, and liveable experience and retail experience for anybody wanting to come into this district.

So under the current zoning, these uses and this type

of corridor actually could be built. So under the commercial right now, what you are seeing here is a big box retail, fields of parking and an area that we're concerned that, if we can make those, some of those zoning recommended changes to offer an opportunity for a developer to understand what is the vision for Concord.

Again, some of the uses that actually could currently come into play and so you could certainly have a distribution hub and other industrial uses in the area.

So RD-2 District, Research, Limited Industrial, existing permitted uses, all of these functions can currently go on in here. So everything from medical and dental office to meeting and banquet facilities to publishing, printing, sports clubs -- all right, let's go -- hotels, motels, et cetera.

And, again, what we are looking for is the opportunity to expand the uses in the Capital District -- Barb, go to the next one -- and, again, looking at living, adding under the Innovative Site/PD, the live/work and multi-family residential.

So in talking about zoning controls, we wanted to make sure that we cover some of the areas that is in the, in the text and that we understand that we're wanting to make sure are in place for the community. And so the, some of the design standards that we have recommended in terms of what is in here, maximum development coverage for townhomes, that's in there. Maximum development coverage for stand-alone multi-family, that is controlled, maximum lot coverage, building setbacks, streetscape standards, maximum number of dwelling units per acre, maximum and minimum number of dwelling units per structure, and significance more detailed review criteria

including traffic and economic impact studies.

So in terms of the review process, the review process is, for the Innovative Site/PD, the overlay district, is to require the reapplication conference. So this is required between the applicant, the Zoning Inspector, Zoning Commission, Trustees and other staff from the township and county as deemed appropriate.

And, again, I know you have staff here that can go into further detail. I'll just give the overview and then we can turn it back over.

Formal application, after that is done, the formal applicant and development plan is required, and that application and development plan and all required supporting information and documentation, that is Step 2 of this process.

Three will be the review for completeness. Once deemed complete, the plans are distributed to other regulatory agencies for review and comment. So, again, Steps 1, 2, very important before it can even be distributed throughout, throughout the agencies.

And then the Zoning Commission review of development plan, so that will contain public meetings. Those reviews will be in accordance with all applicable requirements of the Zoning Resolution and those specified in Section 21.08(I). Review each plan and application subject to the regulations set forth in zoning and the design standards.

Step 5, Zoning Commission recommend -- recommendation to Trustees. Like we are here today, having an opportunity to understand the plan, have the applicant make the presentation, approve, request modifications, whatever that process entails based upon what you are seeing, the control is here, and even

deny. 1 Six, the Trustees' review of the development plan. 2 If and when a plan is approved and recommended for the 3 Trustees, then it goes into another set of public meetings 4 looking for the application process and defining the plan 5 requirements, again, set up in the section. And upon 6 7 conclusion of these meetings, the Trustees can adopt, they can 8 modify or deny the recommendation of the Zoning Commission. 9 And then, seven, the zoning permits are issued by the Zoning Inspector that comply with the approved final 10 development plan. 11 That's it. Thank you very much. 12 Is that it? 13 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Thank you. Does anybody on the Board have any questions for Mr. Risinger? Frank, no? 14 MR. SCHINDLER: No. I think he covered it 15 thoroughly. 16 17 MR. McINTOSH: No. 18 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: 19 MR. MORGAN: No questions. MR. PETERSON: I'm good. 20 21 MR. RISINGER: Thank you. 22 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: I have question for you. 23 MR. RISINGER: Yeah. 24 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Even if this plan is adopted, 25 it's an overlay, right? MR. RISINGER: Yes. 26 27 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: So even if this plan is 28 adopted and if we were to move forward with this particular plan, the existing uses that are there today will still be able 29 30 to be used moving forward.

MR. RISINGER: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: And with regards to the overlay project, are you, are you considering that this is an all-or-nothing type of a proposal where somebody has to come in and do the entire -- it's going to be the entire project?

MR. RISINGER: No, no.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Or can they look at components of that project?

MR. RISINGER: We anticipate and except them to be looking at components of that. Certainly, the goal is to make sure that somebody that comes in has a long-term vision for Concord Township. We're looking for a team that wants to be invested in the community, not looking to do one parcel and then walk away. But it is anticipated that they would undertake different parcels at different times and, obviously, implement a phased plan that could take ten years, as an example.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Could the overlay be adopted without the housing?

MR. RISINGER: I believe the overlay is to, in terms of -- can you explain that further when you say without the --

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Well, if we are going to consider this as an overlay district, okay, and let's say, for instance, that there are a lot of favorable components to this that we like but there are some things that maybe we don't like. Is there, is there an option to adopt this, you know, from your design standpoint, is it feasible to do something that would not include the housing?

MR. RISINGER: I think that, I think that, in terms of the RD-2 District, the overlay gives the potential

development future an opportunity to comprehensively have a solution that could support a commercial district and support other elements on there. The current RD-2, the overlay district is, is not taking away any of those current uses and indeed we're adding the opportunity for the residential.

So I don't know if there is any, if there is -Certainly, adopting the overlay would be to adopt, to adopt the residential.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right. And is it your contention then, with considering this project as an overlay district, that the housing would be a critical component of everything, that you really couldn't do or you don't see the development reaching its full potential without the housing?

MR. RISINGER: Ultimately, from our understanding and our research on the market and what is driving commercial today, the residential is, is an important component of that.

And we're not, certainly, we are not saying even in the plan that it has to -- that that plan has to be the only solution.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

MR. RISINGER: And so to have, to have a developer that has the option to bring in a residential component with the other uses currently both in the RD-2, as well as within the Capital District, we believe offers you a long-term sustainable solution for development.

MR. McINTOSH: I don't know if I am asking the same question the Chairman asked. Here in the area, we've got a couple of these kinds of projects that have gone under -- or gone under way in the Cleveland area, metropolitan area. I think one of the first ones that comes to mind is Legacy Village, which is down in the Beachwood, Lyndhurst area. I

know on the far as west side we've got, over in Westlake, we've got Crocker Park. I've traveled a bunch. I know there is more going in on 271. I've been to Chicago, a lot of the other areas, kind of, found myself in similar -- when I see these things, it seems like more and more of them. Of all the ones I just listed, almost all of them that I can think of, with the exception of Legacy Village, have a residential component to them.

Are you finding, in the last, when this whole process really started intensely '04, '05, '06, so are we looking in the last ten years a shift from the lifestyle thing to the residential component being a stronger? Because that I believe that the new one going in has got a residential component that's not far from here.

MR. RISINGER: Yeah, we are. And what we did was we went back and we looked at probably a dozen case studies of communities that have integrated solutions that are both residential with the retail component. And one of the examples that we were showing you up here was the Glen Town Center development, which is in the Chicagoland area. And one of the key components of that was a mix between the residential component, as well as the commercial and mixed use. And what they found was that, by having that mix, they could attract retailers who are looking to come in and understand that there are the opportunities for the residents to be part of that base for their success.

And so I will give you the example of when you look at Crocker Park, I think that if they could do it over again, they might probably have more residential in that component and less retail, and only in that the retail, until it, again,

finds its balance between sole retail buildings versus mix-used 1 buildings, it's very difficult to be successful. 2 And what we are seeing today, the trend is a 3 lifestyle trend in terms of experiential retail. So it's 4 looking at the opportunity to go to maybe that bakery or go to 5 see your dentist or go to that small bookstore. It is that 6 7 lifestyle component. These lifestyle centers are relied upon 8 the traffic that's coming in off the highway driving into their development. What we were going back and looking at in our 9 research to say, we're looking for a long-term solution for 10 Concord Township, so one that is saying let's make it a 11 sustainable solution that works independent of bringing in all 12 13 the traffic driving on and through 44 just to solely stop here. We're staying we think we can have a good blend of both, and 14 residential is a key component to those developments. 15 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Out of the total acres of the 16 project, how many acres would be in that, would be included in 17 that residential component? 18 19 MR. RISINGER: Barb, do we have that? MS. DICKSON: Thirty percent. 20 21 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: About what the percentages 22 are? 23 MR. RISINGER: Thirty percent. 24 MR. PETERSON: Thirty percent. 25 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Thirty percent? 26 MR. RISINGER: Thirty percent. 27 AUDIENCE MEMBER: What does that equal? 28 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. So the project is a 29 hundred -- how many acres, a hundred --

MS. DICKSON: A hundred and seven.

30

MR. RISINGER: Well, the total, the total area is 107 1 2 acres. CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: 3 Okav. MR. RISINGER: If you include, when you include the 4 RD-2 District that we have represented. And when you take out 5 the riparian corridor, when you look at the open land 6 7 requirements that we have, the streetscape requirements that we 8 have, what you start to see is that the actual buildable area of the number of units is reduced to an appropriate number and 9 that's scalable for a developer to look at. 10 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: So out of 107 total acres on 11 12 the project --13 MS. DICKSON: Thirty-four gross. CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Thirty-four gross acres. 14 MS. DICKSON: Yeah. 15 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. So then out of 107, 34 16 acres of that 107 --17 MR. RISINGER: Yes. 18 19 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: -- is, is potential for housing development? 20 21 MR. RISINGER: For residential, yes. 22 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. For mixed-use housing. 23 MR. McINTOSH: That would be the maximum? 24 MR. RISINGER: Yes. 25 MR. PETERSON: I have a question. At one of our 26 meetings we had -- This, we've had two or three meetings on 27 this now -- we talked about approximately 192 housing units in 28 the development. Using an national average of 2.2, I think, we 29 used for people per dwelling, we're looking at 400 residents, roughly, 400 to 450 total. 30

MR. RISINGER: In that, in that townhome and --1 MR. PETERSON: In the town center. 2 MR. RISINGER: -- multi-family, yes. 3 MR. PETERSON: Okav. So 400 is the number we're 4 looking at, roughly? 5 MR. MORGAN: What's the perceived or expected open 6 7 space percentage? 8 MR. RISINGER: Building space percentage? 9 MS. DICKSON: Seventy percent coverage, so 30 percent for residential, 20 percent for commercial, just comparable to 10 the case studies. 11 12 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: So you are saying 34 acres gross for the residential component, that doesn't include any 13 -- anything taken out for roads and everything? 14 MS. DICKSON: Correct. 15 MR. RISINGER: So you would have another, you know, 16 20 to 25 percent on the roads and then whatever the additional. 17 And 30 percent for green space. 18 MS. DICKSON: MR. RISINGER: For the green space. 19 MS. DICKSON: So it knocks it down considerably to 20 21 how much is actually buildable. 22 MR. RISINGER: In the refinement that we went 23 through, one of the comments that was coming back to us was to 24 make sure that that, one, the graphic that you are seeing 25 certainly represents what you -- what might be a maximum case 26 scenario on density; two, making sure that there is control 27 points in terms of achieving the sustainable community design, 28 the living and walking community, that those elements aren't 29 going to disappear when somebody goes to implement the plan.

So that's -- So when you are seeing the 30 plus acres

30

of the gross and then the green space that's open and required, you start to see that you have good control over the density of this, of this area.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right. So then about, you say about 25 percent, is that your position on the, on the amount that would be taken out of the, out of the 30 percent? So about a quarter, a quarter --

MS. DICKSON: There is, green space is open space and then there is another buildable percentage that would be roads, driveways --

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

MS. DICKSON: -- sidewalks, all of those kinds of things. So you are talking about at least 45 to 55, 65 percent, in that range, that is not buildable land area in terms of, you know, it won't have a building on it that has a house in it, that has either open space or the access to that or public space.

me, so I understand, so out of 34 acres that we're dedicating to the housing component on this, there is approximately 50 -- I am going to be conservative. I think you are being a little liberal. I will be a little more conservative and say 50 percent, okay, of that. So we are talking really, in essence, 17, about 17 acres of that 34 acres that will actually have housing on it?

MS. DICKSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. Out of 107?

MS. DICKSON: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. So really we're talking probably, in essence, maybe 10 percent? Even though

it's designated as 30 percent of the total project, about 10 1 percent of that project would be dedicated to residential? 2 MR. RISINGER: On the, on the townhome and multi-3 family, yes. 4 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: On the townhome and multi-5 family, not, not including --6 MR. RISINGER: The commercial district. 7 8 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: -- the commercial district if 9 there were to be --MR. RISINGER: Live/work above. 10 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: -- live/work above and things 11 like that. 12 13 MR. RISINGER: Or condos above that. CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right, right, okay. Now, do 14 you have any, do you have any numbers that would indicate about 15 what we could expect from a, you know, a live/work environment 16 where there would be residential above the businesses on the --17 inside the mixed use area? 18 19 MR. RISINGER: No. We, what we do require is the developer responding, they must put together their market 20 21 study. They must come to the table with their overall economic 22 development plan for the community so they can justify what 23 they think that market is going to drive on that. 24 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: So, technically, they can 25 come in and put in the, in that, in that area, they could put 26 in office space, retail space --27 MR. RISINGER: They could put in zero residential. 28 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: -- that has no residential 29 above. That's not the prerequisite.

MR. RISINGER: So the images that we showed you on

30

here, some of them were no residential above the retail. They 1 were actually office. 2 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right. 3 MR. RISINGER: And it's, again, it's dependent upon 4 what they think that market is and what they think that edge is 5 in terms of, you know, maybe you might see all the buildings 6 along Auburn not have any residential. 7 8 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right. 9 MR. RISINGER: And, again, in support of making sure that there is an opportunity where you are picking up the 10 walkable living opportunity where if people are working there 11 and then can go downstairs and use the retail component of 12 13 that. CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. Any other questions? 14 Rich? Gerry? 15 MR. MORGAN: No. 16 17 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Morgan? Frank? 18 MR. McINTOSH: We're good. CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: I think we're good. 19 you very much for your time. I appreciate the presentation. 20 21 MR. RISINGER: Thank you. 22 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. The next component is 23 we would like to have --24 MR. PATTERSON: Is this a public meeting? CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Pardon me? 25 26 MR. PATTERSON: Is this the public meeting? 27 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: We haven't got to the public 28 participation part. MR. PATTERSON: I beg your pardon. I thought you 29 30 were. I am sorry.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: The next component, Heather, we have a, for the public record, we were given a complete list of recommendations from the Lake County Planning Commission for all of the amendments that we have on the public hearing agenda today. Heather, I would like you to come up and, kind of, run through those for everybody so we know what the Lake County Planning Commission has to think about this proposal.

MS. FREEMAN: Okay. Mr. Chairman, just so the audience knows, with any proposed zoning amendment, the process that the township has to follow is, once the amendment has been initiated, we send that for review and comment to the Lake County Planning Commission, who then holds their own meeting on that and makes recommendations to the Zoning Commission on whether or not that amendment should be made, and sometimes they have suggested modifications. Sometimes we incorporate those, other times we don't.

So we've had in your packet, we just received actually a letter dated July 31st from Dave Radachy, who is the secretary for the Planning Commission. And I will just read it in part here. "The Lake County Planning Commission took under consideration the resubmission of the above-mentioned zoning text changes at their regularly scheduled meeting on Tuesday, July 25, 2017. The Lake County Planning Commission recommended that the text amendments be made with the following changes."

They do have a handful of suggestions for the text amendment for the creation of the new Section 21 in the district amendment of establishing the location for the Innovative Site Plan Development. Their first comment was that the Zoning Commission needs to consider addressing circumstances where sidewalks may be located outside the road

right-of-way. And there was concern on whether or not, if there wasn't an easement there, that the public wouldn't be able to use those, those sidewalks.

We did, we did make an adjustment to the zoning text with the, with the latest version that is in front of you that has already been incorporated into the change where we, we understand that the setbacks were based on a 60 foot road right-of-way; however, in some cases, the county or -- may require a larger right-of-way, could be up to 80 feet. So by adjusting the right-of-way portion and scaling back the setback standards, we feel, between that and poss -- and granting easements, that we have that covered. So staff doesn't feel that there is any more work that we need to address as far as sidewalks outside, outside of the public right-of-way, between those two, expanding the width of the public right-of-way and/or granting the easements will cover that.

The second comment that they had in their letter here was to reduce the dwelling unit sizes. The letter is indicating that the dwelling size proposed for townhomes is larger than the minimum square footage for a two-story house in the single-family district. The multi-family units are larger than what is required for every type of permitted residential unit except for two-story single-family homes, 1,600 versus the 1,500. The live/work unit is the same as a ranch single-family home. And they have also indicated that, over in Painesville City, the three-bedroom apartment at Cobblestone is roughly 1,463 square feet.

But as you know, this is -- we've reset this. So we have seen these comments from before and we already made some changes before this came back to you for this public hearing.

Some of these may have been overlooked by the Planning Commission but we did make the modification already in the text. It's already been initiated and it's in front of you. As far as we're specifying that, for that, the townhome was, for a two- to three-bedroom -- for the townhome that it was exclusive of the two-car garage. So it's a 2,000 scare foot dwelling but that's inclusive of the two-car garage. So, in essence, the living area is a little bit smaller.

And then we are not even doing the live/work units anymore. Those were removed from the proposed amendments due to the fact that there were some concerns already on what would happen, if the business failed, to the person that was living in the residential component. And so that was -- And that use probably wasn't really going to be practical anyway within Concord Township. If you're going to do the mix-used development, it's most likely going to be a condo above and not a live/work unit. So staff doesn't feel that we need to make any more modifications on the minimum square footages.

They also had some recommendations in regards to referencing an existing "swimming pool" definition and to define a "tennis court"; however, we feel that we can refer to the ordinary English meaning, as we do in other cases where we don't necessarily have terms defined in the Zoning Resolution.

The next bullet point under here was to require all of the residential development to adhere to the Federal Fair Housing regulations. I think Eric, kind of, covered that in his presentation, and I agree that I don't feel it's necessary to add additional language because we expect all development to comply with all local, state and federal regulations, including the Fair Housing Act.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

MS. FREEMAN: The open space language in Section 21.07(D)(4) is ambiguous, difficult to define what is "significantly professionally" means and what is considered "high quality." We don't, staff doesn't feel like that we need to make a change in regard to this because, depending on where the open space areas are, it may differ. If it's in the recreational component or the civic neighborhood, what is significantly professionally designed may differ than, than an open space area in over near the townhome development. That might be a smaller park for residents to play in.

The last comment under this amendment was that the green infrastructure solutions that are referenced, that we should -- oh, that the green infrastructure solutions should be -- should reference, instead of the phrase "planters," can be part of a larger stormwater processing solution that is approved. We don't define "green infrastructure" but -- and we don't regulate stormwater processing solutions, but I think developers and people that are reading the zoning know what a stormwater solution or processing solution is and that really falls on the county. So we don't feel that we are going to make that change and make the definition of "green infrastructure."

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

MS. FREEMAN: And that's it. So that really covered Amendments Number 1 and 2. They reviewed those as one, kind of, creating the text and then also defining the area.

I do just want to, you know, bring to the attention that I think it's been stated, we already have in the existing Zoning Resolution text for the Innovative Site/Plan

Development. It's just set up in a different manner. And what we are trying to do with these amendments is to further refine the process of reviewing a plan that may be submitted and also hone in and -- some of the other bulk district regulations.

So currently in the Capital District, you could submit an application to the Board of Zoning Appeals and you —to develop the Innovative Site/PD as a mixed-use development under what's currently in the text under Section 13.36.

However, with the process that we're proposing to do, we would like to change how that's reviewed. Rather than doing it as a conditional use permit, we're creating the overlay district which keeps the underlying zoning in place, the RD-2 and the Capital, and this is an opportunity for a landowner or developer to submit an application to the township which first starts out with the Zoning Commission, and Eric, kind of, walked you through what that review process would be, ultimately to the Trustees, who then would have the final decision on that.

So that is one of the significant changes as to what's currently in the text and what we're proposing to do with this amendment.

Back to the Planning Commission, they had a couple suggestions as well as it related to our Amendment Number 3, which relates to the Definition Section of the Zoning Resolution, which is Section 5. They had suggested a couple modifications to our proposed definitions for "private street" and "public street" and also suggesting that we add a new definition for "controlled right-of-way." We reviewed these with legal counsel in the past and we didn't feel like that we wanted to -- It wasn't recommended that we make the changes per

the Planning Commission's recommendation, so we want to stick with what we have already proposed in the amendment.

And also as far as the "controlled right-of-way," it isn't necessary to create that definition. We don't have any regulations that pertain to a controlled or limited access highway anyway.

For our Amendment Number 4 that related to Section 11, Zoning Permits, the Planning Commission recommended that we make all the text amendments.

For Amendment Number 5 which related to our changes in Section 13, Conditional Uses, the Lake County Planning Commission recommended that we make -- or recommended approval of those amendments.

For our Amendment Number 6 which is in relationship to Section 15 on our Residential District amendments, the Lake County Planning Commission had recommended approval.

Our Amendment Number 7 which is in relationship to Section 16, which is the R-2 PUD/RCD section of the Zoning Resolution, the Lake County Planning Commission recommended approval with one modification. They would like us to acknowledge that condominiums can be developed in the R-2 and that requiring a plat to be filed prior to a zoning permit to be issued is not practical. They further explain that condominiums are built first and then added to the county records as a plat. They will need a zoning permit in order to start construction.

We have looked at this and I think the text that we're suggesting does account for that. I don't feel like the modification is necessary because the language actually states in our proposed change that any, that any required final

subdivision plat is recorded. Therefore, if a development is not a subdivision but rather a condominium-type development that doesn't require a subdivision plat, then we -- then the subdivision plat doesn't have to be filed. We can go ahead and issue the zoning permit as long as it complies and then the condominium plat is filed after. So we are talking about subdivision plat versus a condominium plat. They're not the same, as you know.

And then our Amendment Number 8 which is in relationship to Section 22, which is our Commercial and Industrial Section, the Lake County Planning Commission recommended that we make the text amendment.

Amendment Number 9, which is our -- in relationship to Section 29, which is our existing parking section, they had a couple comments on here. They state that the Lake County Planning Commission is recommending that we allow multiple small recreational vehicles to be displayed for sale when the multiple recreational vehicles are in on the same trailer. And I will skip down the second paragraph here that kind of relates to that. It says that it is noted that the, that the recreational vehicle included "jet ski" per the new definition. If you limit the number of recreational vehicles allowed to be displayed and sold to one, someone cannot display the two jets they want to sell.

We didn't change how we were regulating selling recreational vehicles. We made one modification to the definition. That wasn't a standard that this Board, we were looking at at the time. So we are not going to make changes to the number of recreational vehicles folks can sell. That just wasn't a topic that we were proposing an amendment on, so I am

not recommending that we do that.

Also, they included under the same Section 29 that just to make sure that the regulations stay consistent on how we reference the "recreational vehicles" within the Section 5, 15 and 29, and we did double check and we were being consistent with that.

And then also within Section 29, staff mentioned that the -- the Planning Commission staff had mentioned that the new Section 15 refers to "garages" while the section refers to "enclosed parking areas." The terms should be the same. I think this was a carryover from when they originally looked at the amendments. We went ahead and made that change back to make sure that we were referring to "unenclosed parking areas" rather than "garage," so we eliminated all the references to "garage" and kept with the "unenclosed parking areas."

Also in relationship to our Amendment Number -- Amendment Number 10, Section 34, the Lake County Planning Commission recommended that the amendment be made.

Our Amendment Number 11, which is in relationship, relationship to Section 36, the Lake County Planning Commission recommended that the text amendment be made.

Amendment Number 12, which is Section 37, Lake County Planning Commission recommended that the text amendment be made.

Finally, Amendment Number 13, which is in relationship to Section 38, Lake County Planning Commission recommended that the text amendment be made.

So I don't know if you guys have any more questions for me on that or any further discussion about any of the recommendations.

MR. PETERSON: One question, Heather. 1 MS. FREEMAN: Sure. 2 MR. PETERSON: When we talked on the size of our 3 4 proposed housing units that we would have in our amendments, those are minimums. So a developer would come in, they could 5 build any size they want as long as there was, at least, that 6 size. They would build bigger units, correct? 7 MS. FREEMAN: Correct. 8 MR. PETERSON: Right. 9 MS. FREEMAN: Yeah, minimu. 10 MR. PETERSON: So this is just a minimum. 11 MS. FREEMAN: Correct. 12 13 MR. PETERSON: Okay. CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Any other comments, 14 gentlemen? Frank? 15 MR. SCHINDLER: No. 16 17 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Morgan? Gerry? MR. MORGAN: 18 No. CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Thank you, Heather. 19 MS. FREEMAN: All right. Sure. 20 21 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. Now we are going to 22 open up this public hearing to the audience portion. I would 23 like to establish a few rules for everyone to adhere to. 24 Anyone wishing to speak will provide their name and address for 25 the public record before they speak. You can say you're in 26 favor or opposed to the amendment and reasons why. If you have 27 a specific question, those questions are to be directed to the 28 Board, not to other members of the audience and not to the 29 develop -- not to the consultants. There will be no questions 30 directed to anybody else. There will be no cross-talk and

chatter back and forth within the audience. I expect we keep things in a very professional level.

All comments will be limited to three minutes. So you will have three minutes to come up and state your position and then you can have a seat. There will be no cheering or clapping, and there will be no course or unprofessional language tolerated. Okay?

Once everyone in the Town Hall has had a chance to speak their piece, we will have a five-minute recess and, if there is an overflow in the other facility across the parking lot at the Fire Hall, we will ask that the people that are here get up and leave and go over to that location where you can watch the rest of the meeting to allow those people that wish to speak to come over here. Okay? That's just off of deference to your fellow citizens that may want to speak that can't come in here right now because we are at capacity. So when everybody is done here talking, we are going to take a five-minute recess and then we'll allow those people to come over and take that place.

There will be another public hearing on this, so keep that in mind. This is just the first phase. There will be a second public hearing with the Trustees, so you will have ample opportunity to take and digest everything that's being covered this evening and take a look at it and then you will have an opportunity to, again, address the Trustees at their scheduled public hearing.

I understand this is an emotional issue for a lot of people but we want to try to keep this at a, at a reasonable level. Obviously, there is a lot of people here. People have some things they want to say. If somebody comes up here and

states a position that you've already -- you were planning on 1 saying, our preference would be that you just come up and say, 2 "I agree with the previous person that spoke." There is no 3 reason to rehash the same issues over and over again, so we 4 will do that in deference to time. 5 Okay. So with that said, on my right -- or on my 6 7 left, your right, I would like to start with Row 1. Anybody 8 that would like to come up and speak in favor of the proposed 9 amendment. None in Row 1? Anybody in Row 2 that would like to speak in favor? 10 MR. PATTERSON: I am already hear, Andy. 11 Row 2. 12 13 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right. Are you speaking in favor or are you speak -- are you opposed? 14 MR. PATTERSON: I just want to bring some facts --15 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: 16 Okav. MR. PATTERSON: -- forward. I'm not really trying to 17 say yes or no. 18 19 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Are you, are you in favor or are you opposed? 20 21 MR. PATTERSON: I just want to bring some facts 22 forward. 23 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Is there anybody else in 24 Row 2 that would like to speak in favor of the amendment? 25 Is there anybody in Row 3 that would like to speak in favor? 26 Anybody in Row 4 that would like to speak in favor? Anybody in 27 Row 5 that would like to speak in favor? Anybody in Row 6? 28 Anybody standing up against the back wall? Nobody wants to speak in favor. 29

Okay. Now on my right, your left, anybody in the

30

first row that would like to speak in favor? Second -MR. O'LEARY: I will.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. Sir, I would like you to state your name and your address on the record.

MR. O'LEARY: Sure. My name is James O'Leary. I live at 6349 Ledge Lake Court here in Concord Township.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay.

MR. O'LEARY: I have had the pleasure of being chairman of the Joint Economic Development District Board or the last nine years. I've watched the Board go through a lot of planning and to get to the point where we are today. I am very proud of what we have been able to accomplish. It's not going to happen overnight but we have to do it with some kind of a plan, and I think that this is a good first step to give us the zoning tools that we need to be able to develop this in a controlled manner. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Thank you.

Anybody else in Row 1? Anybody in Row 2 that would like to speak in favor? Ma'am, come on up.

MS. HEMPHILL: Claudia Hemphill, 12367 Concord-Hambden Road. I have to read. I don't speak well from -CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Sure.

MS. HEMPHILL: As a resident since 1960, I am totally in favor of these amendments. The residents, back in the '60s and since then, have not been pleased when all the current development began. Our bucolic -- which was a little extreme -- friendly township changed drastically. The large tracks of land went to what was then considered high-density housing. The people who have lived in and do currently live in Quail like what they have. Other developments enjoy their

environments. All of this development incurred in the tracts of land that made the township more rural in nature. The semi rural -- which is not an accepted zoning term but it works well -- nature of the township is under the homes of many of our residents.

I see people all over Concord happy with their lifestyle. Wonderful, I think that's great. Different strokes for different folks. In retrospect, there is room for all of us to live in an area of Concord that appeals to the lifestyle we like. If the residents who are opposed to the proposed amendments took an hour or so and drove around the entire township to see all the different kinds of lifestyle, they would see a significant number of different options, from living on 50-plus acres to living in an apartment.

The 30-somethings -- I don't have correct generation names. The 30-somethings don't want the big houses and developments that we now have. My kids don't want my big house, that's fine. They want to be in the center of restaurants and activities and want to walk or bike. Many of the seniors in the next several years will downsize and might choose to stay in Concord by being close to restaurants and being able to walk to.

Do not take away the ability to have another area different from yours for upcoming generations, as well as the boomers as we choose a less cumbersome lifestyle. The Trustees are doing what they should do, planning 20 to 30 years out. What will the coming generations want? If the Trustees don't plan to accommodate different lifestyles, like they did for many of the current residents 30 years ago, people will leave the township and younger generations will look for places that

they like with the townhouses and what we just discussed.

Twenty to thirty years from now, many of us will be in small ranch houses, assisted living or elsewhere. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Boy, that was perfect. Thank you. Right on the money, right to the, right to the second. Very good.

Second row, anybody else who would like to speak in favor? Third row, anybody that would like to speak in favor?

Come on up, state your name, address for the record, please.

MS. JARRELL: Chris Jarrell, 10885 Bradley Court here in Concord. I've been here for 19 years. I wasn't planning on speaking. I want you all to know that I'm on the Board of Zoning Appeals here in Concord. I am also a realtor in both the residential and commercial segments of the real estate industry.

I think that this planning process has been in place since '04, '06. We've all had opportunities to come in and talk about it. I guess as I am sitting here and I was over at the Q and A section -- session and I come here and I see that there is a lot of controversy going on. I've been hearing about it. And I liken it to the people that come before the BZA that buy a property and they don't do research on the property and they come in and they, maybe they build something that didn't jive with our setback requirements or something else and they are asking for forgiveness.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Aren't you supposed to talk to them?

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Chris, Chris.

MS. JARRELL: I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Excuse me, sir. Chris, please address your comments to the Board.

MS. JARRELL: I apologize, Andy.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: All right.

MS. JARRELL: So I liken it to that, that somebody that has bought a property doesn't do their due diligence and they are coming in and they're asking for forgiveness, they're asking for a variance and what have you.

Here in Concord Township, for a more global standpoint, we've had these plans that have been in the works for years and years and there have been public hearings. I've been, I think I've been on the BZA since '09. I've been involved with the comprehensive planning process. I've been at all these meetings where the public has been invited. You all live in Concord. You have opportunities to come and state your opinions about what is transpiring here, what I call progress and now, all of a sudden, everything is crazy.

And I would just like to advocate for the project because I know what the trends are in real estate. Everybody likes neighborhoods. We have Willoughby right here in our own back yard and we have Crocker Park with things that Morgan has mentioned, Crocker Park and Legacy Village and all these developments, even like Willoughby, which is already there which illustrates that they have retail, we have office.

Saturday morning -- and I will cut this off in a minute but I just want to be a little anecdotal here. Saturday morning I went to Willoughby, I went to a yoga class, I got out of the yoga class and there was a farmer's market going on and there is people having coffee on the streets, and that's what people want.

Now, it's over there where it's kind of on the periphery of Concord. It's not going to be, you know, hijacking our own neighborhoods. This is what the trends are. They're not shopping malls. This is outdoor shopping and commercial establishments that will make our township a better place to live.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Thank you, Chris. Thank you.

MS. JARRELL: And I am done. Thank you, Andy, for

cutting me off.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. Again, I will remind everybody that we're to address ourselves to the Board just to make sure. We don't want to get into a banter back and forth with the audience. We want to try to get through this as quickly as possible.

Anybody else in the third row that would like to speak in favor? Anybody in the fourth row in favor? Anybody in the last row that would like to speak in favor? Ma'am, come on up, state your name and address for the record, please.

MS. PLESNICAR: My name is Susan Plesnicar and I live at 7915 Auburn Road. I've lived in Concord for 27 years on Auburn Road, and I have seen Auburn Road change dramastically -- dramatically, whatever. I am nervous because I am not used to doing public speaking.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: That's okay. You're good.

MS. PLESNICAR: But for the last five or seven, eight years, this is not a rural area for us. My kids grew up there. They rode their dirt bikes up and down the driveways and had a good ole time. Now I have a nursing home right across the street from me. I have Ranpak. I hear sirens 24/7 going up an down my driveway -- my street. Even the speed limit's been

reduced to 35. So I am in favor for it, yes. It is out of the area. It is an area perfect for that, the new development.

And that's all I have to say.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Thank you very much.

MS. PLESNICAR: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Anybody else that would like to speak in favor of the proposed amendments, number one?

Okay. Now we will go back to my left, your right. First row, anybody that would like to speak that's opposed? Come up, state your name and address for the record, please.

MR. MONROE: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. My name is John Monroe. I am with the law firm of Mansour, Gavin, L.P.A. My address is 1001 Lakeside Avenue, Suite 1400, Cleveland, Ohio. I represent Concord Real Estate Investments, LLC. Concord Real Estate Investments, LLC, owns the majority of the 107 acres that would be rezoned in this overlay district. I am also joined here tonight with -- by Bill West. He is with the Hanna Commercial Real Estate firm. He is the broker for the remaining acreage in the park. And I am also joined by Chris Hondlik, up against the wall there. He is also with the Hanna firm that is helping market the property on behalf of the property owner.

The property owner is opposed to this rezoning, specifically Amendments 1 and 2. The current zoning districts, you know, there is two here, the Capital District and also the RD-2 District, which allows for light industrial uses, research-and-development-type uses. And we feel that this proposed zoning overlay would have a chilling effect on the sale of the remaining lands to the north, up Discovery where the two existing facilities are located. De Nora Tech has a

beautiful research and development facility, high paying jobs, jobs of tomorrow. There is also Cinetic which is at the end of the line all the way up against Route 90.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

MR. MONROE: You will remember both of these properties were developed by the Swagelok Company. What we're concerned about is, if this front part of the area is developed and retail and housing, that there will be a conflict with the sale of the remaining property toward the back in terms of traffic, noise, light, truck traffic, what have you.

Secondly, we feel that these proposed amendments conflict with the Declaration of Covenants and Restrictions that was placed on the park. And when I talk about "the park," I mean the 250 some acres that comprise this whole development. I wrote those declarations and they have restrictions on gross floor area, lot coverage, improvement placement, minimum lot size, architectural review. And I can tell you that those declarations and covenants and restrictions were drafted for a light industrial park. So as long as this property owner has a majority interest in the park, they are going to have a say about what happens. So the zoning is one thing, private restrictions are another. We believe this proposed rezoning will conflict with the declaration.

Finally, we just --

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Now, excuse me just for a second.

MR. MONROE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Now, this is not a rezoning.

MR. MONROE: I understand that but --

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: So that's why I want to make

sure that we're clear because that's an important term. 1 MR. MONROE: And, legally, I'm not -- Legally, I am 2 not sure I agree with you. 3 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay, and that's fine. MR. MONROE: You are treating it like a rezoning. 5 You are having a public hearing. 6 7 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right. 8 MR. MONROE: You are having -- so you are going through all the hoops as if it were a rezoning, and you are 9 potentially adopting an overlay district which adds a bunch of 10 uses that are not currently allowed. 11 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: But it doesn't, it does not 12 take away the existing uses that are, that are available, 13 correct? 14 MR. MONROE: I agree with that. I agree with that. 15 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: So if, even if this overlay 16 were to be adopted, okay, I am just trying to understand 17 18 because I am not a lawyer. MR. MONROE: 19 Yeah. CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: I am trying to understand. 20 21 So if this overlay is adopted and you want to use the property 22 for what it's zoned for now, you still have the ability to do 23 that. Nothing is being, nothing is being eliminated from your 24 use; is that correct? 25 MR. MONROE: That's correct. And, obviously, we have 26 nonconforming rights, which is a whole other can of worms. 27 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right, sure. 28 MR. MONROE: And Bill West can come up and tell you that when he is trying to market this property and particularly 29

the property in the back, if there is houses up front, it's

30

harder to sell the property in the back to industrial, light industrial users if there is houses up front.

Now, we would say, yes, there are two assisted living facilities toward the front but they're much different uses and I think we all know this. Generally, people in those types of facilities don't go outside a whole lot and their windows are typically shut. So it's a whole different animal that you are looking at tonight where you have single-family homes, you will have recreation facilities, I guess. I am not sure who is going to pay for that but you are going to have outdoor uses with people interacting.

So Bill can certainly testify -- he's got 40 years of experience in the industry -- that -- and Chris has over 25 -- that this is going to make it more difficult, even though it's an overlay, to sell what's at the back.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Thank you.

MR. MONROE: Just one final thing. We did meet with officials, with Concord officials. We've been very clear on our position. And this ties into one question you had about, can we just limit the housing? We are not opposed if the township wants to re -- apply a zoning overlay district to its parcel, have at it. We have no opposition. They own seven acres. Do what they gotta do. What we are concerned about is what we have left and the ability to sell that in large tracks.

And they've been a very, over the years, been a very conscientious member of the community. They've gone with high quality developers to sell parcels to and have made significant investments. That road that was installed, both Capital Parkway and Discovery and the extension road, were built to light industrial standards with -- These roads will last

forever. There was also significant infrastructure built for 1 stormwater and water facilities that will benefit someone at 2 some point. 3 But we would ask that, as long as our client owns the property that they have, that it remain as it is and allow them 5 to continue to market the property as it is. 6 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Thank you. 7 8 MR. MONROE: Thank you. 9 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Appreciate your comments. May I make a comment to that? 10 MR. PETERSON: CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Sure. 11 MR. PETERSON: Mr. Monroe. 12 13 MR. MONROE: Yeah. MR. PETERSON: I work for a light manufacturing 14 company that built a plant in Highlight Heights on well less 15 than a 100 acres and we had 2,000 cars coming and going every 16 day on three shifts. So under your proposal, if we were to do 17 that and do light manufacturing, it's possible we could have 18 2,000 cars coming in and going everyday on three shifts. 19 MR. MONROE: It could be. 20 21 MR. PETERSON: Okay. I just wanted --22 MR. MONROE: It's what permitted by the zoning, yes. 23 MR. PETERSON: I would like to make that clear, that's an alternative, 2,000 cars coming everyday. 24 MR. MONROE: I don't know what the size is of the 25 26 facility your at. 27 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: All right. Thank you, sir. 28 Okay, any -- Folks, quiet down, please. Anybody else 29 in Row 1 that would like to speak opposed? Okay. Row 2, Bob,

I think it's your turn. I think it's your turn.

30

MR. PATTERSON: I had all this time. I am Bob

Patterson, 10940 Girdled Road, Concord. I had all this time to
just to soak everything in. I think, so far, it's a great

meeting. I do think that the Zoning Commission tonight is at a
crossroads of a very important decision to make. I would like
to step back for a minute and address the survey done by
Risinger. Is your name Risinger?

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Risinger.

MR. PATTERSON: Risinger. My wife and I are from Chicago. We grow up there. They cited several examples in Chicago which were very successful, and I agree. I don't disagree. However, there's 70 million people in that area in Chicago. We don't have 70 million people here, slight problem.

They cited the 2004 Comprehensive Plan. The most important section of the plan wasn't mentioned, the eight percent commercial that we're talking about in the JEDD was to remain sacred and not be developed for residential. That's in the plan. They never mentioned it.

mentioned that retail is dying. Twenty-five percent of retail is going to die in this country this year. Sears has left.

Maggiano's, a high-end restaurant, is leaving Beachwood. Are we going crazy here? You have a decision and this is why it's so important. Our Trustees have already spent a million dollars of our tax dollars on buying seven acres for their vision of Concord, what do you know, this thing that was presented. If we go down this path and it doesn't work, we don't get the retail, we don't get the high-end restaurants, we are going to look pretty stupid.

I know that the developers have to put their money up

before anything and say, "I'm going put this in. I am going to put these stores in. I am going to put the residential in," but they're not going to do that. I don't really think they're going to do it.

Here is what my proposal is. We're sitting on a cash cow. You are getting \$600,000 a year from the JEDD. You are going to get another million in a few short years, probably less than a year. That's a million bucks flowing into our township that has no incumbrance on it at this point except to finish paying for the road. Think of what we can do with a million dollars a year in our township paving roads, getting everybody off everybody's back and not worrying about this vision?

How many people here care if you get one more person in Concord? We've got plenty of residential areas in Concord that are flourishing. People are moving here. We're up 15 percent. We're increased 15 percent from the 2015 plan. Hey, we're in, we're in, we're in heaven. This is heaven. Why ruin it? Why put high-density -- You know, it's not a bad word. It did work in Winnetka, in the Naval Air Base. Big deal, that doesn't mean we have to do it.

You guys have the ability to go back to the Trustees tonight or tomorrow and say, "Let's rethink this." And if they did a good survey, why didn't they get the people involved? A lot of -- There was some criticism at the Q and A, no one attended the public meetings. That's because we trusted our Trustees. We thought they were doing -- I met with them for ten years on and off. They never once mentioned high-density residential, not once.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay, Bob.

MR. PATTERSON: I am getting kind of excited. 1 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Understood. 2 MR. PATTERSON: But what I am trying to say is it 3 would be a good idea to say, "Stop. Let's get the people, you 4 know -- Let's let everybody know what's going on now." 5 Grapevine came out a week before your meeting and it wasn't in 6 there. Remember somebody asked you that, you know? You had no 7 8 answer. Why wasn't it in there? Everybody knows now and every 9 -- And these are good people. Concordians are good people. They want the best for the township. These guys might be 10 right. I don't know. But it sure hasn't been noodled around 11 enough, you know. 12 13 My only recommendation is you stop it, please have everybody rethink it, and think of that million dollars a year 14 plus coming in in another year. 15 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Thanks, Bob. 16 17 MR. PATTERSON: Thank you very much. CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Appreciate it. 18 19 All right. Anybody --MR. PATTERSON: We're going to watch the rest on TV. 20 21 It' hot in here, I hate to tell you. 22 MS. PATTERSON: I'm Sandra Patterson, 10940 Girdled 23 Road, and I agree with everything he said. I am definitely 24 against it. 25 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. Thank you very much. 26 MR. PATTERSON: Thank you very much. 27 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yep, thanks. 28 Okay. Anybody else in Row 2 that would like to speak 29 in opposition? Come on, sir, state your name and your address,

30

please.

MR. DAVIS: Hi, my name is Dan Davis. I am at 11378 South Forest in Quail Hollow. My wife and I moved here three years ago. We love it here. We came here for a very specific reason and, in three years, we've had a tremendous disappointment that's come down on us. It's a financial one. And I think that the question I would like to pose to the Board and anyone else that can answer it over time is about the taxes that will be levied against us to support this. Our taxes have gone up 40 percent in three years, our property taxes. It's getting to the point where, if it continues to do that, I think I have to look at moving to somewhere else because I didn't want to come to a place where I had to put my single- or fixed-income lifestyle at risk because of spiraling taxes, levy after levy taking more and more and more from each homeowner to support things.

Quite frankly, I believe this is going to hit us all in the pocket somewhere and I feel it's incumbent upon all of you and the Trustees and our consultants to tell us, what's this going to cost us as homeowners who could care less about whether this comes in or not or maybe really care? But the point is, we should know what it's going to do to us. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Thank you very much.

Anybody else in the second row? Okay, move to third row. Anybody in the third row that would like to speak in opposition? Sir, please state your name and address for the record.

MR. BILINSKY: My name is Walter Bilinsky. I reside at 7960 Augusta Lane, and I have some concerns regarding firefighting on a structure that's four stories high. Do we

have fire trucks in Concord that can go up four stories? 1 MR. PETERSON: 2 Yes. MR. BILINSKY: We do. How many? 3 MR. PETERSON: I don't know the number but we cleared 4 this with the Fire Chief. 5 MR. BILINSKY: Yeah. He can handle that? 6 MR. PETERSON: He's comfortable with it. 7 8 MR. BILINSKY: Okay, good. One of my concerns is that somewhere down the line, in order to fill these 9 properties, we are going to start offering tax abatement and 10 then there is no advantage to increasing our tax base. I see 11 it happening in other cities. I hope that we don't revert to 12 13 that here. I, for one, like low-density housing, no sidewalks, 14 no street lights and less traffic, and that's why I moved out 15 here into that neighborhood. They said that they were going to 16 make a parking garage for the town center area. That's going 17 to be underground and accommodate how many cars? 18 19 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Heather, do you recall? MR. PETERSON: It's just a concept, yeah. 20 21 MR. BILINSKY: It's a concept. Well, before you 22 approve something, I think you ought to know. 23 MR. PETERSON: Well, we don't know until we get a 24 proposal. 25 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right. 26 MR. BILINSKY: And then it's not up there anymore but 27 there was a plot map and it showed all these apartments on the 28 left side and it, kind of, downplayed the parking situation there. Now, most households have two cars. And the figure you 29

were coming up with, was it 18 or something like that, 18 units

30

per acre times 17 acres. Was that just for town center or was 1 that for the housing, also? I don't think that included the 2 apartment looking buildings. 3 Up there, you know what they look like to me? 4 look like what's on the border of Mentor and Painesville on 5 Diamond Center. That's what that looked like over there, just 6 7 the housing. 8 MR. PETERSON: Just a concept, just a concept. 9 don't have a plan. The developer will develop the plan. MR. BILINSKY: Yeah. But once, once you approve the 10 zoning, then --11 MR. PETERSON: Yeah, but we have to see the plan to 12 approve it. Again, we are not going to build barracks. 13 MR. MORGAN: But that's why we, that's why we've 14 created the zoning and limited the development of housing. 15 MR. SCHINDLER: This gives us the control. 16 MR. MORGAN: It's less than 30. It's 30 percent or 17 less of the gross acreage of the development for housing. 18 19 includes the townhomes and the multi-family. And then multifamily would be, would be limited to 10 percent of that 30 20 21 percent, so a total of 3 percent. If you do the calculations 22 and it builds out to complete buildout, that would be -- Let's 23 see if I have my numbers right because I did that -- a total of 24 64 multi-family units. MR. PETERSON: Which could be condos. 25 26 MR. MORGAN: If it was a complete buildout in that, in that residential area. 27 28 MR. BILINSKY: I live on one acre. I can't even imagine sharing that with 17 other families. 29 MR. MORGAN: Well, that's, that's --30

1 MR. BILINSKY: Thank you for your time.

MR. MORGAN: Well, that's you. There are people who do.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Thank you, sir. Appreciate your time and I appreciate your comments.

Anybody else in the third row that would like to speak. I will move now to the fourth row. Ma'am, speak your, speak your name and address for the record, please.

MS. LoCONTI: Lisa LoConti, 8140 Mount Royal Drive. I think somebody next is going to speak to that last fact that you just gave. But, first of all, I have a question. And I know I am not allowed to address the gallery but Isinger -- or Risinger, Eric Risinger Company from Chicago, I mean, like, right off the bat when I saw that, I thought to myself, are we really going to even entertain letting people from Chicago -- I came in here unscripted because I had something to say but then it all changed once I heard. I mean, literally, Chicago, Illinois, we want them to come in and build out Concord Township. Really?

You know, and then he says "we finally get a walkable neighborhood." I don't think there is any "we" when he lives in Chicago.

And then the market wants this. And I am not sure what that market is because the survey said in 2004, attached to the 2004 Comprehensive Plan, that survey did not want it. And only 6,000 people were polled and 30.3 percent responded, which is an astronomical number when we only expect like 10 percent to respond. And of that 30.3 percent, overwhelmingly they said no to this. So --

And I was just curious. Maybe you can answer. I can

address Mr. Risinger. He mentioned Glen Town Center. Is that the name of the place in Chicago, Glen Town Center, they built out? Are we allowed to ask? Glen Town Center?

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Something like that.

MS. LoCONTI: Okay. Because Glen Town Center in Chicago that I know of that I looked up, Crain's Chicago Business wrote an article and published an article on May 21st of 2014 that that development was repossessed by the lender and sold for a fraction of the cost that was owed to the bank. So, I mean, I will look that up and make sure that we have the right information, but he cited it as something that we're trying to be and that's what happened in Chicago. That was interesting to me. I just found that out while I was sitting right there.

So we have lots of fancy words like "live, work, play," but anybody that lives in Willoughby -- Do you guys ever, like, drive past, you know, downtown Willoughby? We were talking about downtown Willoughby. There is that, thought it was going to be cool new place because, if you look at the poster, the people on the poster look really cool and it says "live, work, play" and they're, like, drinking wine and it looks like you want to hang out with them and it's in front of Riverwalk. I think it's called Riverwalk Apartments, which are dumps. My girlfriend is trying like crazy to get out of there because the walls are paper thin. I mean, it is an absolute disaster. There is no live, work, play there but, again, it was sold exactly like this.

So I just wanted to read one thing and then I'm done.

I wanted to let you know that I found on Chris Galloway's

Facebook page something that caught my eye. Maybe you guys

read it, too. It was shortly after the News Herald ran the Town Center article on the weekend of July 1st. Chris Galloway posted the same article to his Facebook page. That post is gone now but, luckily, I took a picture of it. And it said Jim Trakas, who is councilman-at-large for Independence, said the following as a warning to all of the Trustees and personally to Chris. He said, "Be careful. So many developers expect the taxpayers to subsidize their investment. Independence found this out. So many want to use TIFs," public tax dollars, "to pay for their investment and land donations, essentially no risk and all profit. I urge you, set parameters about public participation before you go out for proposals. We did not and found out that someone was willing to build a mixed-use project and profit from it but put not -- but not put much of any cash on the barrel head to actually invest in the project. I am urging caution." So, again, this post has since been removed. I was really, really alarmed by that comment by Mr. Trakas. CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. Thank, thank you very much.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

MS. LoCONTI: Okay. Am I up? Is my three minutes up?

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yes, ma'am.

MS. LoCONTI: Okay. So just for the record, I just want to say that I am very against any residential zoning on this very precious plot of land that's in my back yard. And if anybody wants more information, they can go to DefendConcord.com.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Thank you.

Okay. Anybody else in the fourth row that would like to come up and talk? Anybody in the fifth row? Anybody in the

fifth row that would like to come up and talk?

MR. CARTER: Bob Carter, 11464 Somerset Trail here in Concord. I am going to be short and sweet. I would like my Concord to look more like that picture than the ones I saw up here an hour and a half ago. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. Thank you very much.

Anybody else in that row that would like to come up
and speak? Yes, sir, please state your name and address for
the record.

MR. MIOCIC: My name is Dario Miocic, 6993 Sturbridge Drive here in Concord. My wife and I moved here in 2011 and plan on starting a family. Part of the appeal to moving to Concord was the rural environment. She grew up in Wickliffe, which is quite a busy town, and I grew up in Mentor, which is something that we both wanted to get away from.

I'd just like to say for the record that I think it's very important that, before we make all these decisions, that if we take into consideration the pace of people that are moving into Concord every year, that we need to redo a survey and we need to take everybody's opinion into fact. I think, you know, as I moved in in 2011, three weeks ago is when I really noticed all of this. I tried to read Concord's website page often and try to see what's going on in the community. We get the Grapevine, we read it. And it's shocking to me that that is being overlooked and not being reconsidered with all the new population that we do have in Concord. So I am just stating for the record that I am against the zoning of housing or residential in the new district.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Thank you very much.

MR. MIOCIC: Of course.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Appreciate your comments.

Anybody else in that row that would like to have anything to say in opposition? Last row seated, anybody that would like to have anything to say in opposition? Sir, please come up state your name and address for the record, please.

MR. DERENZO: Good evening. My name is Dennis Derenzo. I'm at 10912 Stonewycke Drive here in Concord.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: I am sorry. What was your name again, Dennis what?

MR. DERENZO: Derenzo.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Derenzo. Thank you.

MR. DERENZO: I just wanted to voice, my opposition. The previous speakers have done a nice job. My concern is more along the lines of what happens along State Route 44 since the new interchange has come in because where I live, trying to get onto to highway going northbound is very difficult during morning rush hour and coming southbound when I get off of the highway at the interchange, very difficult going southbound. So putting in high-density residential that's going to be trying to compete in that cross traffic, I am very concerned about. That's, that's just really what I wanted to say. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Thank you very much.

Anybody else seated in that last row? Anybody standing in the back that would like to speak, please come on up. Technically, sir, you weren't standing, but I will give you -- You will get an opportunity. That's all right. You're good.

MR. HACH: Hello, my name is Tom Hach and I live at 11575 Fay Road. I am also on the Riverside School Board. I am

speaking as an individual, not for the School Board. But from my perspective, really what we need to do is continue to diversify our economy and moving away from the commercial and light industrial, to me, is absolutely the wrong answer.

To paraphrase the gentleman who spoke earlier about being on a fixed income and being hit with taxes, which clearly I have been a part of raising. If we have diversi -- our ability to diversify the economy and spread that, that tax burden over more commercial and light industrial entities, I think, to me, it's just a no-brainer. We need to, we need to diversify ourselves. We need to increase the tax base that way and that would take some of the load off of the residents who are here. So, to me, this is an no-brainer. It's already, it's already there and we just continue to build it out as such and that, to me, makes the most benefit for, for the community.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. Thank you very much.

MR. HACH: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yes, sir, you are next. You were semi-seated.

MR. WILTSE: Richard Wiltse, 7721 Woodstar. I have only been here two years. We moved to Concord, like a lot of other folks, to kind of get away from the whole city and the traffic and whatnot. I guess my question to the Board is, I know we've been at this for a while, looking. How many data points do we really have on the effect of high density? Okay? And by that, I mean, you've hired a competent group behind me here to do that but in their, in their presentation, I didn't see where they really cited any data points in their facts versus myths, myths versus facts, however you want to state it.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: When you say data points,

what do you mean by data? Can you define that?

MR. WILTSE: Well, for example, on crime rates.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

MR. WILTSE: And then high-density areas, okay, they said that, moving to the high density, that there is, you know, no, no relative change in that, right?

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

MR. WILTSE: Citing what?

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

MR. WILTSE: Okay. So I am asking you as the Board, did you do your homework on this, right, more than one data point. Okay? Likewise with traffic, property values, the whole nine yards. So that's, that's my main concern.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

MR. WILTSE: I think some of the, some of the stuff is kind of appealing and whatnot. But like a lot of the folks, and not to reiterate, but the effect on 44 is going to be really challenging. I mean, it doesn't take a traffic engineer right now to see what's going on. And if we flood that with anything else, it's going to be a real disaster. So did we, did we look at the alternate roads, right, in our planning? That's it.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Thank you.

Anybody else standing in the back that would like to comment, please come up, state your name and address for the record.

MR. MARLOWE: I'm Tim Marlowe at 7372 Hunting Lake Drive. And my observation is the citizens of Concord may have come to this table late, from your perspective, but we are still citizens and wish to be heard even though we are late.

Supposedly, according to the Trustees and what you have said, there have been public meetings and there has been public discussion. I can tell you from the meeting that was at -- held at the Community Center today and the 50 or so people that you have here now, you've reached an awful lot in the last couple of days that you did not reach for the last several years.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Nothing mobilizes Concord Township like a public hearing.

MR. MARLOWE: Well, it's more than a public hearing, it's what the hearing is about.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: And it's also your right to be here and make your comments and that's why we do this.

MR. MARLOWE: Yes. So what I am saying to you is I've heard, like, a diminishing, like, it's too bad. Where were you two years? Where were you five years ago? I don't think that's a relevant statement to say to us as citizens. So I, number one, just because we are objecting late doesn't mean it's not a valid, solid objection.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: I agree with you.

MR. MARLOWE: Okay. The other issue is when they were pointing out what a wonderful town center this would be -- and I am sure it would be a wonderful town center if the residents wanted it -- I don't believe the existing citizens, in a majority, want this. I think we want what we have. We don't want the changes. And I think that the people that you are trying to reach are not citizens of Concord.

You may be trying, with this concept, to pull people, other people into this community but the citizens who elected our representatives, the citizens that are here now do not want

this proposal. And if you do a zoning change, I think that we'll do all that we can to stop it and to fight it.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: And that's certainly your right to do that.

MR. MARLOWE: Yeah. And I really think that we will.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: That's certainly your right.

Thank you. Are you done? Okay. Thank you very much for your comment.

Everybody in the back that's standing, I take it, has had their say. We will move to my right, your left, to the front row, anybody that would like to speak in opposition.

Okay. Anybody in the -- We will go to Row 2 now. Sir, please state your name and address for the record.

MR. LAZUKA: Chris Lazuka, 8130 North Orchard Road. Tim summed up most of what I -- I feel I agree with every single word he just said. But I guess one thing I would like to add is something that Bob Patterson mentioned in regards to the 2004 Comprehensive Survey. I think, and specifically targeting that survey of Concord Township citizens, which stated -- And I, I jotted it down. One of the big -- This is the last survey of our citizens that was done, as I understand it. Correct me if I am wrong. One of -- On page 40 of the 2004 Comprehensive Plan, Number 7 of their findings was stated, "There was a strong feeling against developing more townhouses and apartments." So in the very same plan that's being referenced here to rationalize this project, you've got the citizens saying, "We don't want that."

So I guess my question is, and I will be done, what data do you have today that contradicts that 2004 data?

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Thank you very much.

Anybody else in the second row? Come up, sir, state your name and address for the record, please.

MR. CREWS: My name is Denny Crews. I live at 7129 Mountain Quail. I've lived in Concord for 27 years. And I can say that there's many reasons why I would be against this plan and I would recommend that you would stop it dead in the tracks. We can talk about that. You've heard a lot tonight, traffic, the danger of taxes going up. But I think the most compelling reason for you, your group, to just stop this for right now, just stop it, is that we live in a democratic society.

We can argue that maybe we should have known this, maybe we should have been here, maybe we should have watched the Trustees closer. But even though you are not elected, you are an appointed board, you are still part of a democracy. And I think that, if you believe like we believe, that for whatever reason, late or not, the majority of the population is against this plan, I think that you are beholden to table this until which time we can know more about it, can understand it and have input and buy-in. I am definitely against this. I think it should be stopped right now and tabled. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Thank you.

Anybody else on the second row? Ma'am, please coming up and state your name and address for the record.

MS. WROBLEWSKI: Yeah. I'm Debbie Wroblewski.

I live at 11771 Jennifer Court for 39 years. And I just have one little common sense element to add to this. Why would anyone want to move to this JEDD area, to the residential, to pay an income tax, into a township that has no income tax, and drive half hour, 45 minutes, an hour to work every day? And

far as the senior citizens, why would they want to move there to pay an income tax?

That's -- And just one little thing to add on. I think we should support our businesses on Crile Road. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Thank you.

MS. MATSKO: Hi, good evening. I will try to keep it short as well. My name is Kari Matsko, 10915 Girdled Road. I also moved here for the typical reasons, to get away from the city life. I was near South Park Mall interchange, right over there in Strongsville. So 15 years ago, approximately, I moved here.

I won't bore everyone with the same commentary. I agree with everything everyone has said in terms of the opposition to the plan. My property is basically the south end of where this development is planned, so I am basically in ground zero. So my biggest issue is the traffic concerns. And the best neighbors that we've had thus far on Auburn Road have been the commercial industry.

So I would also like to, I guess, ask a question either to the Board or to, perhaps, to think about with the Trustees. I don't know if everyone has recently seen in the news lately that Amazon.com is moving Midwest and there is fulfillment centers. One might even -- They're looking at Randall Park Mall where they're going to not just move into a building but demolition and start from scratch. That's 1,000 jobs.

So I think there is a lot of potential for the Concord Real Estate Investments, LLC, to bring a lot of jobs and a lot of important commercial to Auburn corridor there as

opposed to this plan. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Thank you.

Vanessa.

MS. PESEC: Hello.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Hi.

MS. PESEC: I have comments and I thought I would pass them out if I can so, as I go through them, you will be able to do that.

MR. RISINGER: Do you want to hold it?

MS. PESEC: No. Thank you.

talked about. I do want to just explain the residential density. It is 30 percent, up to 10 percent can be the multifamily, but then you have to add a plus sign because there can be residential above all of the mixed-use development. So you will have -- could easily have, per the zoning text, not the pretty picture but the zoning text, many more than 30 percent residential units. So please be accurate when you talk about the number, potential high end of the number of units. All above that retail could be, could be, all above the mixed use and the commercial could be retail.

And so I recommend, first, that you remove all residential uses, and people have talked a lot of about that, so I don't need to go into that anymore.

Also in Section 21.2, it states that all of the changes after this overlay is approved are ministerial acts. Really strange word, people might not get it. What that means is it gives you and the Trustees complete control. Once it's approved, the township residents will never have a say. Thirty years from now, we could have a completely different set of

Zoning Commission members and trustees who may make decisions that are really different from what your pretty picture is showing and the residents would never have an ability to change or challenge it. So I ask that that be removed and that we are allowed a referendum for every parcel change.

Section 21.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Wait. Say that again. You recommend a referendum for what?

MS. PESEC: I rec -- the ability for a referendum whenever the overlay district is being utilized.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay.

MS. PESEC: Just as you do for every PUD that is issued.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay.

MS. PESEC: The same. Section 21.03, "Townhouses shall be attached in groups of two to six dwelling units." The Fair Housing Act -- I said this in 2015. I'm going to say it again. Maybe this time it will work. The Fair Housing Act is only applicable for four or more attached dwellings. So the Fair Housing Act, good for a wheelchair, wide enough spaces, public accommodation, elevators if it's two floors, all of those nice and wonderful things that would help people with disabilities and help the seniors and all the rest are not applicable if your development partners choose three attached dwellings. So please change the zoning text to either say the Fair Housing Act applies regardless of the number of units or change your text to say four or more dwelling units attached. Either way would work but, otherwise, it doesn't help.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. Vanessa, your time is up. So if you want to maybe give us a condensed final comment

here. I don't want to cut you short but --1 MS. PESEC: Sue. 2 MS. CREWS: I give Vanessa the authority to --3 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: No, we are not going, no, we are not going to play games of meeting time. 5 MS. CREWS: That's not a game. It's a wish. 6 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: No, that's not -- Thank you. 7 8 Go ahead, Vanessa. 9 MS. PESEC: Sue, why don't you come on up here and read it with me. 10 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Go ahead and finish what you 11 12 have to say. 13 MS. PESEC: Twenty-one -- I am going through the exact specific things that you are requiring. 14 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. Well, Vanessa, here 15 is --16 17 MS. PESEC: I'm not talking about things, little 18 things. CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Hold on a second, Vanessa. 19 Let me finish. Okay? I, I established before the meeting 20 21 started that there would be a three-minute time limit. You 22 have submitted --23 MS. PESEC: You didn't explain that to people. 24 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: You have submitted, you have 25 submitted in writing, okay, for the Board all of the 26 information that you wish to convey. It's in the public record 27 now. 28 MS. PESEC: Yes. CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Having you talk about it and 29 lecture about it is not, is not really germane to the 30

situation. So you're either --1 MS. PESEC: Oh, so you don't think that people who 2 might be watching or might be in the Town Hall or in the Fire 3 Department in the overflow section, you don't care what the 4 township folks say? I get it. 5 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: I didn't say. 6 7 MS. PESEC: No, you did. 8 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: I didn't say that. 9 MS. PESEC: You just did. CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: No, I didn't. 10 MS. PESEC: You put it in public record. 11 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: No, I didn't. You have --12 You put this in the public record, Vanessa, and your time is 13 up. Okay? So I would like to move on to the next speaker. 14 Thank you. Thank you for your input. I appreciate it, I 15 really do. Thank you. 16 17 Okay. We're moving on to the next person, the next Then it would be Row 4. Come on up, sir, state your 18 19 name and address for the record, please. AUDIENCE MEMBER: Why can't she read the --20 21 MS. PESEC: Here, Sue, read my --22 AUDIENCE MEMBER: She's not allowed to. 23 MR. MORGAN: She can talk she. She said she didn't 24 want to. 25 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah, I want to hear it. 26 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah, we want to hear it. AUDIENCE MEMBER: We can all hear it. 27 28 MS. CREWS: My name is Sue Crews and I live at 7291 Mountain Quail Place. 29 30 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay.

MS. CREWS: Section 21.07, "Maximum Commercial Floor Area. The total floor area of a single retail business or single service business shall not exceed 50,000 square feet, unless approved as part of the development plan." Does this mean that the Trustees have the authority to allow a big box retailer into Concord if it's part of a plan? If so, this approval, this approval language should be revised to not allow a big box retailer into Concord.

Section 21.07(F), "No more than 10 percent of the 30 percent shall be devoted to vertical multi-family housing, exclusive of townhomes and not part of a mixed-use building."

Can this statement be more clearly written? Can this be more clearly written? We're asking that.

Section 21.07(E)(2), "Housing shall be developed and maintained with significant professionally designed open space." What is "significant"? A clearer definition should be utilized, such as a percent.

Section 21.07(E)(6), "Housing Structures and Densities. The following housing densities are permitted within the Innovative Site/PD:

A. Townhomes. Density shall not exceed 9 dwelling units per acre;

B. Multi-family. Density shall not exceed 20 dwelling units per acre."

This density is far too high for Concord. Lower the density or, better yet, eliminate residential from this text.

Section 21.07(E)(8) "Buffering. Where proposed housing abuts an existing residential district not within the Innovative Site/PD the following shall apply:

(b) The proposed development shall have direct

access for the majority of its traffic to a major road and shall not impose significant traffic impacts on the abutting residential district."

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Your time is, your time is -MS. CREWS: What are significant traffic impacts?

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Your time is running out.

MS. CREWS: This word shall be much more defined, such as a percent increase in traffic. A traffic study shall be required and remedies for the excess traffic should be clearly required in this text. The developer should have to pay for these improvements.

21.07(G) "Mixed Use Building Interior Landscaping. For mixed-use buildings, interior landscaping shall comply with the standards below:

(a) Provide public event, paved and green spaces for mixed-use buildings."

Landscape paths should be made with concrete, including colored and stamped concrete. Utilize the Cuyahoga County Universal Design Standards and ban the use of pavers in public paths as they become uneven surfaces which are jarring for wheelchair users and dangerous for people with unstable ambulations. Pavers and paver/concrete junctions settle unevenly during the climate changes, posing significant tripping hazards. However, pavers can be used as a decorative edge.

Section 21.08(B)(15) "Parcels of land intended to be dedicated or temporarily reserved for public use or reserved by deed covenant with the condition proposed for such covenant or dedication." The township should be very careful about who owns and maintains the open space. If the Trustees own it,

there could be considerable maintenance issues. Ownership requirements should be clearly spelled out in this zoning text.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. Your time is up. Thank you very much.

Okay. Next row. Anybody want to speak, come on up. Sir, state your name and address for the record, please.

MR. MASSIE: My name is Brian Massie, 8196 Rainbow Drive. I lived in Concord here for 11 years. I'll try not to be redundant but I am vehemently opposed to this entire transaction for the reasons that have been also already expressed as far as safety and tax increases.

The presentation made by our consultant, Chicago consultants, is that made -- Is that made available? Can I find that online? Because, quite frankly, I am not sure I believe their myth and fact.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Well, I mean, their slide presentation, obviously, all those statistics and all the information that was contained in that presentation is part of the public record. So you certainly could get that from either watching the video or, you know, requesting Town Hall for their transcript of that. So, yes, that's available for you.

MR. MASSIE: Then I will, then I will do that because, rest assured, when I see some of their, you know, when they're quoting the Sierra Club and that sort of thing, I don't know all of their quotes but I'm going to check out their myths and their facts and we will report back to you whether or not we really agree.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Sure.

MR. MASSIE: The other thing is, I just want to let you know that this Board, I couldn't -- I went to the question

and answer session. I couldn't believe that I heard the Trustees say that this really doesn't apply to the people in this room, it really applies to the millennials, those people that are coming down the path.

Well, I, I can appreciate the next generation but I am going to stand up for the senior citizens that are here in this town. And I just want you to think about what you may be doing, pricing these seniors out of their homes, and it's a real threat. So please don't take it lightly. I appreciate it very much.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Thank you for your time. Appreciate your comments.

Anybody else in the next row? Yes, ma'am, come on up, speak your name and address for the record, please.

MS. HAFFA McCOY: My name is Peggy Haffa McCoy and I've been here 50 years.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Good for you.

MS. HAFFA McCOY: So do I --

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: You might win the contest, by the way.

MS. HAFFA McCOY: Do I get more than three minutes?

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: No, no, you don't, but go ahead.

MS. HAFFA McCOY: Okay. I just wanted to tell you that I have an acre and a half and I love it. I sit out on my deck and I think everybody would like to do that. So I think, you guys, I'm not really for it. I'm not really against it because I'm not going to be here that long. But I think of my children, my grandchildren, they love it. So think long and hard because you know what? It doesn't have to be tomorrow.

It can be the next regime that comes in here even. You don't have to make a name for yourself. Think of the people. That's what you should do. That's your job.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: We work very hard at doing that every time, believe me.

MS. HAFFA McCOY: Okay. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Thank you very much for your comments.

Anybody else in the next row? I think we're to the last row. Anybody in the last row? Okay. If everybody has had their say at this point in the room, we're going to take a slight recess. And, Heather, or -- Can you check and see if there are people over at the Fire Station that would like to come over? I think we've had a quite a few people leave. We could probably accommodate some additional people without having to have people leave. We will take a slight recess and we'll start again.

(Whereupon, there was a recess.)

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. Recess is over. We would like to get back to the public comment portion of this public hearing. We hope that we could get some people in from across the parking lot that were watching on TV and they -- I would like to also give them the opportunity to have their say in this process.

We were in the process of having people that were opposed to the development speak. What I will ask is that you come up and state your name and address for the record. You will be given a three-minute time limit to have, have your say and, hopefully, we can get it done in that three minutes.

Anybody on this first row? You are here. Second

row, anybody that would like to speak in opposition. Sir? 1 MR. VIVIANI: Opposition? 2 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Opposition. Please state 3 your name and address for the record. 4 MR. VIVIANI: Carl Viv --5 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Up by the podium. 6 MR. VIVIANI: Carl Viviani, 36235 Ridge Road, 7 8 Willoughby, Ohio. I don't live in Concord but I own property, 9 industrial property in Concord. And I am opposed. Basically, everything I heard today from people that were opposed, I 10 agreed with. And I would only add that, I think, as an 11 industrial building and property owner, I have my own agenda 12 13 that is also opposed from my standpoint. But I think that they all had very good points and I agreed with all of them. 14 you. 15 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Very much thank you. 16 17 Okay. We will move on to the third row. Anybody in the third row that would like to speak? Yes, sir, come on up, 18 state your name and address for the record, please. 19 MR. FOX: This is going to be fun. My name is 20 21 Michael J. Fox. I live at 6991 Auburn Road. I have been here 22 for 10 years. And that is my name. I have other nicknames 23 that people might want to call me. I will quote Ronald Reagan about our Board of Trustees, where I never heard so much 24 25 information about things that just weren't so. That's 26 impressive. But if I wanted to go to a dog and pony show, I 27 would pay to go to the dog and pony show. 28 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. Sir --MR. FOX: If I wanted to see -- All right. 29

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Excuse me.

30

MR. FOX: This is America, right? 1 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: It is. 2 MR. FOX: I'm trying to get my point across. 3 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. But --4 MR. FOX: I have three minutes. Do I get three 5 minutes? 6 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: You get your three minutes. 7 8 MR. FOX: Good. 9 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: If you would like to speak in opposition --10 MR. FOX: I am speaking in a civil manner. Just 11 because it touches you in a way that you don't like, oh, well 12 13 this is still America. It's not your home country of Russia. This is not Marxism. We have a try right to speak. 14 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Sir. 15 MR. FOX: We pay the taxes here. 16 17 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Sir, you will either remain calm and you'll speak --18 MR. FOX: I am calm. 19 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: -- in an orderly fashion or 20 21 you'll sit back down. 22 MR. FOX: Okay. 23 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: That's what we will do. So 24 it's your choice how you proceed, so proceed. 25 MR. FOX: I guess that was a threat, okay. Anyhow, I 26 moved to Concord Township to get away from the city with people 27 stacked on top of one another. And this guy from Chicago --28 Isn't that the crime capital of the world? Oh, that's right. We are getting personal there. What's he know about Concord? 29 I taught in Cleveland, Glenville -- oh, and by the way -- 21 30

years. Highly dense areas are highly crime areas with drug, crime, murder, everything that goes with it. And they want to bring it out here and he wants to quote some myth or facts type stuff? What a -- please.

There is nothing true in what he was trying to present. Anybody can pull up statistics about anything to prove a point. Only thing is, they're not true. I know better. And people moved here to get away from the traffic. The traffic out on 44 and Auburn is ridiculous. It's a cluster. It's dangerous. I watch people skating through the intersection doing screwy things all the time. It take me three times, four time longer than it ever took just to get through that intersection and it's only going to get worse. So I didn't move here to have all these nice little fancy restaurants.

Yeah, I hear about Willoughby. Yeah, I talk to people that are on the boards in Willoughby and they say, "Oh, yeah, it's nice downtown where the pictures and the beer and all this other stuff is." But behind there, all the drug issues going on and the crime that nobody wants to see or talk about. You know, look at downtown. Oh, it's a groovy place. All the millenials love it. Yeah, but what about the crime? And that's exactly what's going to follow out here.

And Ben Franklin told that story a long time ago.

We'll end up -- We're going to look like Europe, we're going to end up like Europe, stacked on top of one another with all the crime. And that's what you're trying to bring in here. And I moved out of Euclid with my wife to get away from all that stuff. Now you want to bring it back in.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Thank you for your time.

Thank you for your comments. We appreciate it.

MR. FOX: Yeah. God bless America, not Russia.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. Next, next, anybody else in that row that would like to speak? Next row, that would be the one, two, three, fourth row, fifth row. Anybody that would like to speak? Sixth row, last row by the videographer? No? I will move over to this side. Anybody in the first row? Second row? Third row? Fourth row? Last row, anybody that would like to speak?

Okay. Now we will move in favor of the proposal. On this side, would anybody like to speak in favor? On this side, we will just go with this side, anybody on this side interested in speaking? What about on this side, anybody in favor? At this point, I am going to assume that the public comment is over.

Is there anybody else that would like to ask any questions?

Yes, Vanessa.

MS. PESEC: I will just speak over here. The very -One of the final points was the, the presenters talked about
the market analysis or they talked about requiring extensive
market surveys and that sort of thing. But in the text,
21.08(B)(5), the requirement is, "the market analysis
indicating projected market for proposal -- proposed project."
That's it. This is a new point.

And so I think that, if you really are serious about trying to understand the plan and what it's going to bring, that you need to be a lot more specific in your zoning text regarding what the definitions and the requirements are for a "market analysis" and "market proposal." Who is it going to be

attracted to, what are the numbers, where are they going to come from, what are their incomes, and so forth and so on? So I really encourage you to put in a much more robust definitions and requirements for that section. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Thank you.

Is there anybody -- Heather, was there anybody else over at the Fire Hall that had an interest in speaking, do you know, or do we have everybody that --

MS. FREEMAN: As far as I know, they were all given the opportunity to come over.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. All right. I just want to make sure. We don't, we don't want do leave anybody out of the process.

MR. SCARVELLI: You asked if there were any questions.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yes, sir. And those questions are being directed to the Board, please.

MR. SCARVELLI: My name is Russ Scarvelli. I live on Malachite Court, 11534. All I want to know is, the statement, first, would be, it seems like there's an overwhelming amount of people who are opposed to this whole idea. Will there be any further action as far as voting by the residents and the voters, the taxpayers here?

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: When you say "further action," what do you mean by that?

MR. SCARVELLI: In other words, before anything goes into play, will we, the citizens and the taxpayers, have the option to vote yes or no for what goes on?

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: If, if this proposal passes and it goes to the Trustees, and if the Trustees recommend and

pass what we recommend to them, and then that will be the end of the conversation. And if the citizens --

MR. SCARVELLI: Well, how is the proposal --

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: If citizens would like to mount a referendum vote against their decision, they have the right to do that and they would have to follow the rules and petition and get the signatures that would be appropriate to put it on the ballot.

MR. SCARVELLI: So how would this take place?

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: And that way the citizens of Concord Township could have a vote. So we've had referendums in the past. It's happened on other issues with regards to zoning in the township and it has gone to vote. Some referendums have passed, some have not. So it's kind of a -
It's kind of a 50/50 proposition as to what could happen.

MR. SCARVELLI: But you stated that it had to go through the Trustees.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: That's correct.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$  SCARVELLI: And then you guys would follow up from there.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: No. We're a recommending body.

MR. SCARVELLI: Oh, you are before.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: We come first. We take their things under advisement. We make a decision. We pass that to the Trustees whether we -- We could either reject this proposal or we can accept it and we move it forward to the, to the Trustees.

At the point, they can override our rejection and still vote for it or they can accept our decision or they

could, you know, they could move in their, in their direction. 1 And there would be a public hearing and an opportunity for the 2 public to have a say then. 3 MR. SCARVELLI: Well, I think it would behoove you to do what the people want. 5 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Sure. And that's why we have 6 7 these public hearings, sir. That's the reason. 8 MR. SCARVELLI: That's what I am saying. It's very 9 important that you do what the people want you to do. CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yes, sir. 10 MR. SCARVELLI: All right. 11 12 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Thank you very much. Appreciate your comments. 13 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Are you going to do what the people 14 want? 15 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: 16 17 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yes? 18 MR. MORGAN: May I ask a question of the residents 19 before we start? 20 21 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Sure. 22 MR. MORGAN: To get a clarification. 23 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Sure. 24 MR. MORGAN: In hearing what I am hearing tonight, it 25 appears to me that the major issue with this proposal is the 26 residential portion of it. And I would like, I'd like, just 27 for further clarification because I am having a hard time 28 understanding why approximately, you know, 300 or 320 possible 29 additional units is a big issue, because that is what we are 30 adding tonight. The portion of this that goes to the

residential that's over, that would be over top of the 1 buildings in the Capital District, that is already in the code 2 as being able to have residential above it. 3 So I guess I'm not, I'm not completely understanding why there is such opposition to, you know, a little over 300 5 some additional residences that are going to be priced at a 6 range that is common with, with this county or with this 7 8 township. Yes, sir. 9 MR. VIVIANI: Do you want -- Can I answer that? MR. MORGAN: Yeah. 10 MR. VIVIANI: Carl Viviani. The answer I would give 11 you is it would set a precedence and one thing leads to 12 another. If you have 50, 60, 80 there and a developer wants to 13 build more, cheaper units elsewhere, well, you let that go 14 through. Why are you going to hold me up? There are none --15 MR. MORGAN: Those precedents are already in this 16 township. 17 MR. VIVIANI: There are none right now in Concord. 18 MR. PETERSON: We have high density in Concord behind 19 St. Gabriel. 20 21 MR. VIVIANI: Are they low income? 22 MR. PETERSON: This is not low income. 23 MR. MORGAN: This doesn't say anything about low 24 income. 25 MR. VIVIANI: I say, but one thing leads to another. 26 MR. PETERSON: Yeah, but we have control through 27 zoning. 28 MR. VIVIANI: Will you? MR. PETERSON: We do. 29 30 MR. VIVIANI: But you have to say no and defend it

and they can go through the courts and, perhaps, overturn you. 1 I don't want any more, period, in the area. 2 MR. MORGAN: They could do that right now. 3 MR. PETERSON: Yeah, they could do that now. CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Thank you for your comment. 5 MR. VIVIANI: That answer is no good. 6 MS. PESEC: Gerry, I'd be happy to answer that. 7 8 MR. MORGAN: Okay. MS. PESEC: You are my mike guy. Thank you. I can 9 hold it since I am not reading anything. Thank you so much. 10 really appreciate it. 11 So I think that, when we talk about high density 12 currently in the township, what is the highest density that we 13 have, six units an acre or eight? 14 MS. FREEMAN: What's actually built out or what is 15 permitted? 16 17 MS. PESEC: No, no, no, in the regular part of the township. 18 MS. FREEMAN: What do you mean? 19 MS. PESEC: In all of Concord, the maximum density 20 21 for any of the current residential areas is, you know, like --22 I don't know -- six or eight, yeah. So this is twice --23 MS. FREEMAN: Well, what's currently built out is 24 higher than what's currently permitted. We have developments 25 that go up 16 units per acre. 26 MR. PETERSON: Johnnycake Extension. 27 MS. PESEC: Right, right. But this being 20 units 28 per acre, as I think -- and is only a compromise currently, you have to remember that the original, that this was presented as 29 175 acres and 40 units per acre. Now we're down at 107 acres 30

and 20 units per acre. That doesn't mean that, as soon as this 1 is done and this is passed, that we won't -- you guys won't be 2 back here hearing another case where it's bumped back up to 40. 3 So as we've talked about precedence, I think that this is big. The other thing is that when you calculated the exact number, you were just using the 107 acres, but realizing that 6 we could easily have more than -- We could have the 175 acres, 8 not the 107. And --9 MR. MORGAN: That's not what's being passed though. MS. PESEC: Well, not now, not now, but it was just 11 presented to us two months ago. 12 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: But that proposal was --MR. MORGAN: Right. CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: -- was removed. MS. PESEC: That's right, it was currently removed. CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: And it was, and it was --MS. PESEC: Right. And under that proposal, it was 192 MR. PETERSON: units approximately or about 400 to 425 people. Now it will be less. MS. PESEC: Right. MR. PETERSON: That's hardly high density. MS. PESEC: Well, it is high density when you look at it on a per unit basis and you take out the things like the 25 open space. 26 MR. PETERSON: What's the down side? What's the down side? 27 MS. PESEC: Well, I think that you heard that, first of all, you have a lot of the folks that have commercial property are really worried that they think that it will impede

5

7

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

28

29

30

their ability to successfully market other commercial properties in the area.

MR. PETERSON: The flip side is it could increase their ability.

MS. PESEC: That is really, really important. When you look at the very pretty plan that the Trustees -- Trustee Malchesky said that plan is just a pretty picture and we shouldn't even look at it. We should only look at the words and the text, realizing that the words and the text are what matter, not the pretty picture. And so you need to understand that it is, that it is just that and that it's the words that really matter.

MR. McINTOSH: Vanessa, Vanessa, a couple things here. First off, I want to make it clear that, you know, we've heard. I mean, we've been here for, you know, going on three hours, soon to be three hours and we've listened. So I don't think -- I'm not going to speak for commissioners. I've heard. I hear the objections and I want to make a couple points.

First off, we're looking at, you know, housing numbers. We've seen some people around 400 or 450. It's 2 percent of Concord's population. Okay? That's a pretty small number. And that is, you know, more on the high side, maximum potential.

It was brought up earlier in some comments too about zoning text and the future boards. Okay. The Comp Plan has had a bunch of things happen to it. We, as far -- So there's been all these different things that have gone along. So for the record, I have been on the Zoning Commission for eight years and I walked into this process with a lot of conversation already in process. I had to learn, pick up the ball and, kind

of, understand it. Okay?

So we went through a process last year and a lot of us came, said, "Hey, we have to look at the text. There is things." In addition to what's being reviewed here, we've got parking. We've talked about impervious surfaces and runoff and the infrastructure and some of the flooding problems. We went through and dealt -- We had the Chagrin Water Partners here in the last couple years. We've dealt with a lot of those issues, all concerns of the township.

So we are hearing this loud and clear. Okay? So we are looking at all parts of it. As a part of that process, we've cleaned up -- I don't know -- in the last year or two, a ton of zoning text.

So somebody made a comment, it might have been you -I apologize if I don't recall specifically if it was you or
not -- that said, what about another board? Okay. What about
another board? Okay? If another board clears out text,
they're going to come in and have to go through the same
process here. We are putting in possibilities. This is not a
plan that says what's going to happen. Okay?

And, again, I want to say I have heard, but I want to put in context what we're doing here tonight. We're passing text. We change text all the time, constantly, two, three times a year. And we've repealed text from the '60s. We recently took out a huge chunk of zoning text that allotted for Breckenridge style thing that they have up in Willoughby between Euclid Avenue and 84 that's the high-rise that has every, every level of senior housing from independent living to full nursing homes. Concord had that in its zoning text since -- I don't recall but, like, 20 years or something like

that and it never got bid on and we, kind of, said, "Hey, it doesn't fit with the things," and it was repealed and removed.

So to sit here and take a look at this and sit there and say, "Well, you are doing this and you're setting a precedent," well, that happens every day and all the time. And this Board, as well as the Trustees, are charged with taking a look at what goes on to deal with consultants -- and, again, not just Risinger but other people have come in and talked on subjects of flooding and so forth -- and to take that in and figure it out and try to determine what's best, you know.

And we listen. We had an apartment complex come in a couple years ago and the Board shot that down because we said it doesn't fit. It doesn't fit, you know.

This approach is something that's completely different than what we were presented with two years ago when we had that. So I want to put all of that in context. I appreciate your comments. I hear what you are saying. I hear your concerns about density.

But to sit there and speculate what a zoning board may do in the future with this, that is a day-to-day risk that we run all the time. I can't, you know -- I am overturning stuff people did 20 years ago all the time. They were privy to information and things that happened then. We are dealing with what's happening now.

MR. PETERSON: And I'd like to tail in on that comment because just a few things. I jotted down the main concerns I heard tonight, and those are the same concerns, by the way, that we had. We've been dealing with this for some time. We all live in Concord, all of us, and we all care deeply about this community or we wouldn't be here. This isn't

a, this isn't a glamorous job. But I've lived here since 1974. I have seen a lot of changes since 1974. But I will have to say this, that Concord Township is going to develop because it's a nice area. We all like living here. You came from Euclid. I came from Painesville. We came here because it was a nice community. Any nice community is going to attract new people. We are adding 80 to 90 new houses each year whether we like it or not because it's zoned and it's free enterprise and it's happening.

Concord is going to grow. We are approaching 20,000 people. When I moved here, we probably had five. We are going to approach 30,000 some day, and I think buildout is 40,000. So that's coming whether we like it or not.

So our job here is to make sure that we plan those steps very carefully. So I listened and I heard complaints about taxes. Everybody's taxes are going up, my taxes too. But look at your tax bill. Each of you look at your tax bill, because I did. Only a small portion of your taxes are going to Concord. The biggest portions are going to the school district, Riverside High School, they're renovating their schools, they're modernizing. We passed a levy. We all voted on that. Mental retardation, we passed a levy. We all voted on that. The crime lab, we voted on that. Metroparks, we voted on that. Those are where our tax dollars are going.

Paul Malchesky put it very well. The average Concord resident's taxes that come to Concord barely pay to fill a pothole, one pothole. Our tax money is -- it's going up but it's not just Concord. It's most of the other things.

So this is a potential here if we put in residences where they're paying a tax. Somebody said, "Well, why would

they want to?" People live in Mentor and pay tax. People living in Painesville and pay tax. You live in a community, you make a decision. Is it worth it to me to pay 1.75 percent? If it's not, I won't go there. But if I don't care, I pay the tax. That money comes in and helps our township. All these little shops and stores along Auburn Road, that money comes in. The employees that work there pay into the JEDD tax. That helps keep our taxes down.

There is nothing -- I have seen Defend Concord. I have seen the emails. This talk of taxes going up because of this is crazy. If anything, our taxes should maintain or even go down depending on how we do it.

And then talked about traffic. Chardon is growing as fast as Concord and that traffic is coming up 44 whether we like it or not. We can't stop that. 44, all these roads are ODOT controlled, not Concord controlled. We lobby, I know our Trustees work all time with ODOT to try to address the traffic issues. This crazy setup that we have that everybody doesn't like, including my wife, where you can't turn south on 44, that's ODOT, that's not Concord. They did that for safety reasons. Whether we like it or not, that's what we did. Will they change it? Who knows. But we can lobby for that. But ODOT controls all the flow of traffic.

And if you've lived in Concord long enough, and most of you have, you know the way to get around to avoid most of the traffic most of the time. Not at quitting at work or starting work. You can't avoid that maybe, but the rest of the time you can avoid it. I'm pretty good at it. I can avoid that traffic.

And then we talked about the industrial base that we

would have down there. That land has sat there for many years zoned industrial. We don't have takers. Nobody is building factories in Concord. It's not going to happen. To the chagrin of our people over here that own the land, it is not going to happen.

So if some developer comes in here and is willing to work with us on putting together a proposal like this that should benefit Concord and they've got the right money, these guys will sell to the right money. You know they will.

Dollars talk. And they're not going to get it industrial or it would have happened.

As far as high density, again, a few hundred more people, hardly any impact on the school system because most of them would be people, like a lot of us, that want to downsize and maybe live in a place like this, or young couples just starting out that would like to live in a place like this.

The apartments that might be in there, probably there will be very few, would be high-end apartments. These aren't Section 8 housing. This is nice apartments where people would be proud to live and ride their bike down or walk down to the town center and go a dinner or get involved in the various activities that are there.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I wouldn't guarantee that.

MR. PETERSON: So 400 people -- Well, let me finish. So 400 people is not high density. So I personally -- and I am not going to, I'm not going to put his words on record but I spoke to the sheriff of Lake County and I showed him the diagram and said, "Is this a concern to you?" We had some discussion. Those are his words but, bottom line, it's not a concern to him. He sees -- He does not see a problem there.

Okay? I, I checked that out because I, like you, are -- I am concerned with that stuff.

But Concord is going to develop, folks. It's going to develop. So it either develops haphazardly, things popping up along the way, or it does it to a plan. Our Trustees have given us a plan that helps us keep Concord, the good things that we like and keep out most of the bad things that we like, you know. And it's going to happen.

Just the other day, we talked about a sense of community in all of this and the Trustee said, "We need a sense of community." I don't know if any of you go to the little concerts over here at the gazebo but I do. And there is only about 200, 200 people -- 50 people that show up each week. But when you're at that concert, there is a sense of community because you see a neighbor or you see a friend. You listen to entertainment. That's a microcosm of what this town center could be.

Last week I went to Mentor's new amphitheater.

Mentor spent \$2 million of tax money -- you want to complain about us spending tax money -- \$2 million for a new amphitheater. I went to hear Abbey Rodeo in concert last week and there were between two and three thousand people there, all Mentor residents, all having a good time, seeing their friends, seeing their neighbors in a really neat environment. And they made a PA address announcement at the end of the concert thanking everybody for showing up and they said, "This is what we envisioned when we built this, a place where Mentor residents could come, get together and have a sense of community." This town center would be a great sense of community, and I don't know why anyone would think differently

of that, you know.

So in closing, you know, I am going to just say this is not going to affect the lady that has the acre and a half out in the country. Zoning out there stays the same. This is one little pocket, isolated pocket that affects very few residents, a few people on Auburn Road. But that's already zoned commercial, so over time that would develop anyhow. This is a little, in a sense, quarantined area that's a self-, self-sustaining village, let's say, with maybe 400 residents, plus the people from Quail Hollow coming over there.

Quail Hollow is building a new group of cluster homes right down here On Crile Road. Those people would go over there for the services, the rest of us here in Concord could go there as we see fit, but that would be what would draw us together as a community. Because, otherwise, we are just a bunch of people living on lots in a nice community. And everyone that comes here wants to close the door and say, "No more after me. I'm the last one in. We don't need anymore development." It isn't going to work that way. We have zoning in place, very careful zoning in place to protect this community as it grows.

And we are working, as a Board here, we are working very, very hard to make sure that the development that happens is done in a systematic and orderly way, and we really are looking out for the good of everyone. And the fact that 50 or 30 or 80 people show up and complain doesn't represent this whole community. I've talked to -- I can tell you I have talked to eight different families, some that called me, and I have not yet had a negative response once they understood what this was all about. Nobody -- They all go, "Yeah, we are going

to get a little traffic." Well, traffic is going to happen 1 anyway. But maybe this helps us with taxes, maybe it gives us 2 a sense of community. But it's a controlled and planned 3 growth, as opposed to chaos that could happen if we didn't do this. So we're working very hard here as a team to make sure 5 that we do the right thing. 6 MS. PESEC: I do believe that, that you think that 7 8 this is a way to control development. And I do, I do believe that, you know, over time you have heard a lot of things that 9 have been going on, and especially maybe 2014 and 2015. 10 are the areas -- the years where you've had some development. 11 I think though that, to your point that you have 12 spoken with some people and they thought it was okay and now 13 there is 80 people who don't think it's okay, the last survey 14 said that it wasn't okay. And nobody --15 MR. PETERSON: Thirteen years ago, thirteen years 16 17 ago. MS. PESEC: I know. 18 19 MR. PETERSON: And things change. MS. PESEC: That's the biggest point of all is that 20 21 why don't we ask?

MR. PETERSON: Okay. Let me address that.

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

MS. PESEC: Why don't we go to the Grapevine and talk to people about that?

MR. PETERSON: Let me, let me address that. I worked in manufacturing for most of my career. We did surveys of our customers. We did surveys every way, shape and form you could think of. But surveys are very ineffective because the only people that respond to surveys are the people that feel really strongly one way or another. Every time I take my car to

Classic, I get a survey. Do I answer them all? No.

Everything was fine. I'm not going to say anything. I don't have time. I am busy. So surveys are only -- You are only going to get a percentage back and those are going to be the people that feel strongly one way or another.

"apartment," what's the first thing we think of? The gentleman from Euclid, I know what he's thinking of. That's not what we have in mind here. Okay? How do you define "apartment"? Condiminium, how do you define "condominium"? There's a lot of definitions of "condominiums," the kind that somebody talked where the walls were so thin you could hear the neighbor. Well, that's not what we are talking here but that could be perceived that in the survey. There is no way a survey can go out to people unless you talk to everybody one on one, and even then you get the certain amount of bias.

We are a township. We elected trustees, elected trustees. Us guys are just appointed. We elected trustees and we trust them to make the right decision.

MS. PESEC: Right.

MR. PETERSON: If they make the wrong decision, you have the power of the vote anytime you want. But I would say this, again, I have lived here 43 years. I have seen a lot of change in Concord, and I've got to say that it's mostly been positive. We fiscally manage money well in this township. The Trustees, I think, do a really good job. All of the different boards like us, I think, work really hard. I'd like to think we do a good job. There are a lot of people that care to make this community work, and certainly we try to make it work for the benefit all of us that live here. We all live here.

MS. PESEC: I agree. 1 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Thanks, Rich. 2 MS. PESEC: But, you know, the thing that you need to 3 understand is that I worked in advertising and direct marketing 4 5 on Madison Avenue in New York City and I know that there are definitely very effective ways that you can get statistically 6 7 significant and accurate studies of the -- of Concord Township, 8 both in terms of the questionnaire and the response rate and 9 there are many ways to do that. And you can see that, by the huge number of people that are now pouring out because there is 10 this big, large change that's going in --11 MR. PETERSON: Huge number of people? We have 20,000 12 people in Concord and we've got 50 that are here. 13 MS. PESEC: Oh, you should have been at the other 14 meeting because there were certainly a lot more. 15 MR. PETERSON: All right, then 200. 16 17 MS. PESEC: But this is really going to change Concord drastically. You talk about the number of units. 18 That's per the pretty picture. Don't look at the pretty 19 picture. 20 21 MR. PETERSON: We don't even have a developer. 22 MS. PESEC: You have to look at the zoning text. 23 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: You know what? I am going to 24 put an end to this banter back and forth. 25 MS. PESEC: And so I think that you should look at 26 that. 27 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Vanessa, we appreciate your 28 comments. You did get to speak earlier, so we're going to call 29 a --30 MS. PESEC: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: -- time on that. Thank you 1 for your input. 2 MS. PESEC: Did you want to say something about --3 MR. PETERSON: We had a couple questions, Andy. Yes? Yes, sir. 5 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Hold on a second, Rich. 6 Hold 7 on a second, Rich. If you have a question, you can come up to 8 the podium, please, and speak. Thank you. 9 MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Chairman, just remind them to state their name and address for the record. 10 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right. Michael J. Fox, I can 11 remember that. 12 13 MR. FOX: Michael J. Fox. MR. PETERSON: We got that one. 14 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: That's a name you don't 15 forgot. 16 17 MR. FOX: Yeah, sometimes that's good, sometimes it's bad. It seems to me, when there's a dissenting opinion from 18 19 what you guys have, that you're threatened by it. Why? MR. PETERSON: No, dissenting opinions are fine, but 20 21 what I am saying is there are probably 10 or 100 times more 22 approving opinions. They're just not here tonight because they 23 don't have the passion that you guys have because you're 24 against something because a lot of false information has been 25 spread. 26 MR. FOX: She was for it. Oh, I'm not supposed to 27 point. I'm sorry. MR. PETERSON: We have a lot of false information 28 spread in the community. I saw the email and I read -- I 29 looked Defend Concord. There's a lot of misinformation in 30

there and people read that misinformation and they get upset. 1 What we're trying to do --2 MR. FOX: Well, I listened to -- What's your name, 3 Morgan? 4 MR. McINTOSH: Yes, sir, yeah. 5 MR. FOX: Morgan, he was talking about text. What I 6 7 see out on 44 is not text. I see problems out there. I see a 8 lot of traffic problems. MR. PETERSON: 9 ODOT. MR. FOX: I heard this guy behind me from Chicago say 10 we're going to reduce traffic. I don't see reduced traffic. 11 MR. PETERSON: He never said that. And understand 12 13 that we hired and agency that happens to reside in Con -- in Chicago. They could have been in Cleveland. They could have 14 been in Painesville. It doesn't matter where they come from. 15 MR. RISINGER: But half our office is in Ohio. 16 17 MR. PETERSON: Okay. So they have offices in Ohio. It doesn't matter. They have expertise in the area. They have 18 19 expertise in that area. That's what they do, so we hired them. It doesn't matter where they live or where they come from. 20 21 It's what they know about this type of activity and development 22 and that's why they were hired. So why would we not listen to 23 the experts? 24 MR. McINTOSH: And I'd like to just make a short 25 comment with respect to the traffic thing, and I think it comes 26 up and everyone mentions ODOT. It is very easy for us to sit 27 here and "ODOT" but, I mean, ODOT manages 44 and they manage 28 90. And we can scream and holler and I can tell you, from personal experience, that I know the Trustees have talked until 29

they're blue in the face about a lot of stuff, the roads that

30

we got that have made some things better, not everybody likes it. So that took a long time to get.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

You come in with a development or something like that that might get out of this text and it's going to force more of an issue, you know. That's going to raise the elevation in ODOT's eyes and they're going to go, "Oh, there is more coming. This is -- has to be addressed." I mean, 44 and 90, at some point, it's not designed for what's coming, what's growing, so, you know, a big perspective.

And I was asked when I joined the Commission eight years ago what my thought was. I think then the hot issue was the RCD that allowed for green space but higher density in the subdivisions and so forth, you know, and corridor was raised. And I thought the idea of managing the growth and putting a lot of the stuff that people want, the conveniences -- I mean, I can't tell you how many time I go through my neighbor, walk my dog, and I hear everyone, like, "When is Drug Mart going to open?" You know, they don't want to go to Chardon, they don't want to go to Mentor for some of the things that they have to snake through traffic is worse. We put it closer, it's going to be easier. It is going to force some of these things that are problems to continue to get addressed, bring the convenience, and we're confining the convenience to an area and we're keeping a lot of these subdivisions in these outlying areas of Concord totally the same. They're not changing. They're staying the way they are. We're not changing the entire township.

MR. FOX: In ten years that I have lived here, I have noticed a marked increase in people walking up and down the street, don't live there. And there is a new house that's

built, I think it was built by Auburn Career Center, so it's on Auburn there. They were casing the place, I know that.

Anybody -- The guy across the street called the Sheriff's Department on it. This has been increasing over the last three, four years dramatically. This is not just a random act. And it's spilling down from this stuff that's going on up here on 44 and 90.

your comment.

And I understand. I'm down with it. It doesn't really bother me, you know. I listen to your words. Well, they sound great but, you know, it's like, well, let's just move a few drug addicts in the neighborhood. It's just one or two. They're not going to affect the whole population. Then all of a sudden, it spreads.

MR. PETERSON: Drug addicts can live in Quail Hollow.

MR. FOX: That's true. I understand all that. I am

just saying that when you start bringing in these high

density -- that's a nice word -- and these, these -- all of the

sudden they turn into Section 8. Next thing you know, they got

the relatives that are coming in. They're the drug addicts.

Next thing you know, the crime is going up. I see it all the

time. I work in Cleveland. I see the hustles. Come on.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: All right. Thank you for

Okay. At this point, I'm going to end the public comment section. Sir, you had a comment?

MR. KOERWITZ: Yeah, I had a question. I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. Well, I am going to

limit it to these last two questions and we're going to, we're

going to end the public comment. Okay. Come on up, sir, state

your name and address for the record, please.

MR. KOERWITZ: My name is Paul Koerwitz. I reside at 1 11555 Olde Stone Court. For the record, I've been a resident 2 of Concord for 46 years and I have seen change more than most 3 people have, including stop lights in places you never thought. 4 We didn't have stop lights. 5 What I don't see, and I've been through this Board 6 7 asking for rezoning proposals on business matters, what I have not heard in all the conversations now or earlier is a real 8 reason to do this other than we want to change the text. 9 afraid of what might be coming. There is no developer asking 10 for anything. When a developer comes in and asks for 11 something, aren't you going to go through this process again? 12 13 That doesn't make sense, why we are doing this now just to protect something that we don't --14 MR. PETERSON: The RFP is going out --15 16 MR. KOERWITZ: The boogeyman in the closet. 17 MR. PETERSON: The RFP is going out to the developers. 18 19 MR. KOERWITZ: Okay. Based on the text? MR. PETERSON: Based on this, yes. 20 21 MR. KOERWITZ: Right, right. So we are writing text 22 to send out to get proposals. 23 MR. PETERSON: Well --24 MR. KOERWITZ: So we are looking to make something 25 happen. 26 MR. PETERSON: It would have to comply with this. Ιt 27 would comply with this. 28 MR. KOERWITZ: So we are making that -- We're looking 29 to make something happen in this area. 30 MR. PETERSON: Yes. In a positive way, yeah.

MR. KOERWITZ: Okay. As opposed to letting it happen 1 organically? 2 MR. McINTOSH: There is --3 MR. KOERWITZ: What's the reason for that? 4 MR. McINTOSH: There is --5 MR. KOERWITZ: That has not been explained. Why are 6 7 we not looking for organic growth? 8 MR. McINTOSH: There's -- The Trustees go and 9 participate in conferences and discussion. There is, I mean, we have Starbucks; and now that they're there, there is other 10 retail. I mean, there is interest in Concord in doing these 11 things. I mean, I would defer to them as far as specifics 12 13 about that sort of thing because that, that stuff tends to slowly filter to us but, you know, we hear about people 14 expressing interest. 15 I mean, there is conversations we get that So and So 16 has made a request or is looking to do, you know, the nursing 17 That stuff trickled in and then we end up with work. 18 So I can't say cite specifics but there are things that float 19 There are people interested in doing projects like 20 out there. 21 this around this area. 22 MR. KOERWITZ: Okay. But they haven't come to the 23 body with it before going --24 MR. McINTOSH: That's not their practice to come to 25 the Zoning Commission for that. 26 MR. PETERSON: They're asking for services. 27 MR. McINTOSH: They express interest to the township. 28 We hear about it from the Trustees and the office. MR. KOERWITZ: Right. Like I said, I have been 29 30 through the process.

MR. McINTOSH: And so this stuff --1 MR. KOERWITZ: A few of you were on the Board at the 2 time, so I understand that part of it. But if the developers 3 aren't coming in and asking you for it without sending RFPs to 4 get them --5 MR. McINTOSH: No. I think what I'm saying, sir, 6 7 is --The residents are asking. 8 MR. PETERSON: 9 MR. McINTOSH: There are, there are interests in 10 people doing it. MR. KOERWITZ: Then why aren't those people the ones 11 12 doing the presentation to modify the text? 13 MR. PETERSON: They're citizens. The citizens are asking for services. 14 MR. KOERWITZ: The citizens. 15 MR. PETERSON: Trader Joe's, how many people have 16 said to me, "Why don't we get a Trader Joe's in here?" Maybe 17 we could, you know, maybe we could. 18 MR. MORGAN: And some of it has to do --19 MR. KOERWITZ: Okay. But I don't understand --20 21 MR. MORGAN: Some of it has to do with the current 22 economic situation and the developers and they're not willing 23 to come in and do -- The way they used to do it is come in and 24 make these requests. 25 MR. KOERWITZ: Right. 26 MR. MORGAN: Developers are no longer willing to do 27 that. Developers are looking for the areas that are already 28 planned and ready to go. MR. KOERWITZ: That will, so we want --29 30 MR. MORGAN: And then will come in --

MR. KOERWITZ: So we're trying to encourage that 1 growth? 2 MR. McINTOSH: We are trying to make it attractive to 3 developers to come in and bring something that we can put, you 4 know, that we can have --5 So the developers --MR. KOERWITZ: 6 7 MR. McINTOSH: -- set standards. 8 MR. KOERWITZ: Are developers asking for us to add another 320 housing units? 9 MR. PETERSON: Well, if you were a developer and you 10 were coming in here, you would do whatever it took to make --11 12 If you were to invest millions, if, you would do -- you would propose whatever you felt would make your project a success. 13 You might not want housing but --14 MR. KOERWITZ: But I would propose it and ask for 15 what I was looking for. 16 17 MR. PETERSON: Well, you might not want housing in 18 there but you might, and so our regulations have to say that you can have it. 19 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. So what we're dealing 20 21 here, what we're dealing with a lot here was speculation. 22 MR. PETERSON: Yeah. 23 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. People are speculating 24 that this could happen, that could happen, what if, what if. We don't know all the answers. Okay? The best we can do is we 25 26 can craft the legislation that will make a clear path for a 27 developer to understand what he is able to do. But to 28 speculate beyond that --29 MR. KOERWITZ: So, so we speculate --30 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: To speculate beyond that is

really, you know, well, this could happen, that could happen, 1 yes, that could happen and, then again, it could not. Okay? 2 This, this could continue --3 MR. KOERWITZ: But are we speculating by the text 4 we're writing? 5 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: The property owners, the 6 7 property owners that have the property in consideration for 8 this right now, somebody could come in tomorrow and propose a light industrial/manufacturing facility or a distribution 9 facility and that would be well within the purview of the 10 zoning that's in existence and that project could start right 11 away. Okay? So all this is is another tool in the toolbox. 12 13 That's all it is. MR. KOERWITZ: But we are taking away some of the 14 capabilities. 15 16 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: We are not taking away anything. 17 18 MR. McINTOSH: We're not taking away anything. 19 MR. PETERSON: It's still there. It's still there. CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: We're not taking away 20 21 anything. 22 MR. PETERSON: This is an overlay. This is an 23 overlay. 24 MR. KOERWITZ: In front of what you are reviewing? 25 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: It's an overlay proposal that 26 allows --MR. PETERSON: Additional use. 27 28 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: -- a developer to come in and 29 use this property in another way. It doesn't change the 30 underlying zoning. It doesn't change the existing uses that

the property owners have at their disposal. It keeps 1 everything in place. 2 MR. McINTOSH: More options. 3 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: It's just another option. MR. PETERSON: It's an option. 5 It's nothing more. It's not CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: 6 -- See, that's why I kind of took exception to the comments 7 8 that were made earlier about we were making a zoning change. 9 Okay? And you can maybe argue that point but it would, I think, it kind of goes to the extreme. It's not a zoning 10 change, it's an additional option from a zoning standpoint to 11 12 use for use of this property. 13 MR. KOERWITZ: So you're adding on additional zoning options without any request for it. 14 15 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Not zoning options. It's a, it's a development. It's very specific. So even if -- You 16 17 have to remember --MR. KOERWITZ: But it's a, it's a development 18 19 option --CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right. 20 21 MR. KOERWITZ: -- that you are adding on without a 22 specific request. CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: But you have to remember that 23 24 if somebody did want, if a developer came in and proposed this, that's not the end of it. It's a conditional use. It's a prop 25 26 -- they would have -- There would be more conversations. The 27 Zoning, the Zoning Commission would have a lot of tools at 28 their, at their ready to make changes and have them change their plans and we have a lot of ability to dictate what goes 29

30

on.

MR. KOERWITZ: So if we could do that --1 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: And then you can imagine --2 MR. KOERWITZ: If we can do that --3 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: -- there's going to be 4 public, there's going to be a public portion for that. 5 MR. KOERWITZ: -- when they come in to make a 6 7 proposal --8 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: You know, that's not -- This isn't something that's done behind closed doors. It's public. 9 MR. KOERWITZ: But if we can do that when they make a 10 proposal, why are we doing it before the proposal. 11 MR. McINTOSH: It doesn't mean --12 13 MR. PETERSON: You've got, you've got to let them know what the rules are so they can make the proposal, if they 14 want to do that. 15 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yeah, yeah. 16 17 MR. KOERWITZ: But they're going to go back and ask 18 for changes to those rules. 19 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Maybe not. MR. McINTOSH: What we're seeing is developers pass 20 21 on us because we don't --22 MR. LUCAS: Gentlemen, gentlemen, this is the point 23 that the court reporter is trying to take down what is said. 24 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right. I'm sorry. 25 MR. LUCAS: If it was lawyers doing a deposition, she 26 would have already said, "One at a time. I can't take down 27 everything." 28 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right. MR. PETERSON: Good point. 29 30 MR. KOERWITZ: So I guess what I am hearing and maybe

this is not clear to everybody, maybe I am the only one missing 1 this, we are now changing the rules to get the proposal to go 2 look for opportunities for them to come back and maybe change 3 the rules again, right? CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: 5 No. MR. MORGAN: No. 6 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Not even close. 7 8 MR. McINTOSH: No. CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: 9 Sorry. MR. KOERWITZ: Okay. But you just said that a 10 developer may come in and ask for changes, right? 11 12 MR. MORGAN: They may. They could always do that. MR. KOERWITZ: Okay. 13 MR. MORGAN: Anybody can come in and ask for changes. 14 MR. PETERSON: You have to have a baseline. You have 15 a baseline, which is this rule back. 16 17 MR. KOERWITZ: And we are changing the baseline. 18 MR. PETERSON: No, no, we're not changing it. MR. KOERWITZ: You have a baseline already, right? 19 MR. PETERSON: This was --20 21 MR. KOERWITZ: You have zoning in place, correct? 22 MR. PETERSON: No. This is the zoning for that 23 district, okay, for that district, the overlay that we are 24 talking about. So these are the rules. 25 MR. KOERWITZ: The ones you're adding onto. You're 26 adding onto your overlay --27 MR. PETERSON: We're giving these guys more options to make money. 28 MS. JARRELL: Mr. Koerwitz, I'm going to speak out of 29 30 turn right here because I'm on the Board of Zoning Appeals.

need to tell you -- Chris Jarrell, 10885 Bradley. I just want 1 to say that developers come in here all the time and ask for 2 variances. 3 MR. KOERWITZ: Right, correct. MS. JARRELL: But this would allows us to --5 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. Hold on. 6 MS. JARRELL: -- facilitate. 7 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Hold on, hold on, hold on. 8 9 MS. JARRELL: To facilitate the development. 10 Developers always ask for issues. And I would say, on the most part, we are very accommodating to the developers in the area. 11 12 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: All right. Thanks, Chris. Okay. At this point -- Okay. 13 MR. MONROE: Thank you. 14 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: This is going to be the last. 15 This is going to be the last comment and we're going to bring 16 the --17 18 MR. MONROE: It's very short. 19 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: I don't see any value beyond what's going on here and discussing. 20 21 MR. MONROE: Well, it's very important. 22 talking about my client's legal rights, okay, not wants, not 23 wishes, not desires. We are talking about my client's property 24 rights. Okay? So let's focus here on that for a minute. 25 the first thing, I want to make it absolutely clear on the 26 record, the RFP better only be for the property owned by the Concord Township Trustees. Okay? So it better not be for 27 28 property that the township does not own. Okay? We have 29 already crossed that bridge once. We were told that the RFP 30 was only for the seven acres. So if it's more than that, we

better find out about that.

Also, and this goes back to your point,

Mr. Lingenfelter, the request tonight for this whatever you

want to call it is for 107 acres, not 7 acres. So, obviously,

you are affecting our client's property.

I think, at least, four of you have made your decision, so I don't want to belabor the point. But I do think it's very distressing to hear things thrown around by the Zoning Commission that is not correct. I heard one commissioner saying tonight that zone -- industrial uses are not going to happen. They are permitted --

MR. PETERSON: But they haven't.

MR. MONROE: -- by Resolution. They are permitted.

MR. PETERSON: I said they haven't happened.

MR. MONROE: Okay. They haven't happened yet, okay, but I hope you are not predisposing yourself to some decision you've already made.

Secondly, I heard, well, this is a conditional use. It is not a conditional use. So please don't throw around that term.

Finally, and I am just giving you something bigger to think about. Zoning is about expectations. Our client bought this property when -- it might have been before the zoning was in place. But his idea was that it was going to be zoned semi industrial. Okay? That was the expectations. Now you are adding another permitted use. So whether you say it's changing they're not -- the use or not, you are adding something that wasn't permitted before. Okay? So that's an important distinction. You have heard our client is opposed to it. If you want to go forward, that's fine, but we have noted our

objection for the record. 1 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yes, you have. Thank you. 2 Okay. At this point, I'm --3 Sir, I do have just on one point of MR. HACH: 4 clarification. Tom Hach, 11575 Fay Road. There was 5 information that was provided at the question and answer that 6 was different there than here, and that was on the referendum. 7 8 It was stated over there that there could be, with the changing 9 of the text tonight, that there would be no ability for referendum. You had stated otherwise. I would just like to 10 know what the answer is. 11 12 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: No, in the process, in the process. 13 MR. LUCAS: There is no referendum -- I will answer 14 that because it's a legal question. 15 16 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right. 17 MR. LUCAS: And also because several people asked me that tonight already. 18 19 MR. HACH: I'm sorry. I'm not sure I'm fully tracking. 20 21 MR. LUCAS: Yes. 22 MR. HACH: There is no opportunity for referendum --23 MR. LUCAS: Not, not through the action here at the 24 Zoning Commission. 25 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right. 26 MR. LUCAS: They're a recommending body. 27 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right. 28 MR. LUCAS: And as I mentioned this to Vanessa 29 earlier before the meeting began, they recommend either to approve the amendments, they recommend against the amendments 30

or they can modify, right? But they're just a recommending 1 body. It goes up to the Board of Trustees. The Board of 2 Trustees then schedules a public hearing, much like this 3 meeting, people come and speak for or against it. Then they, 4 at the conclusion of the public hearing, they have a designated 5 period of time in which to make a decision. 6 7 So let's assume, for the sake of the referendum 8 issue, they all decide we're going to vote in favor of all these amendments at the Trustee level. Now that's when the 9 referendum is triggered. You have 30 days from -- I'm sorry. 10 It goes into effect within 30 days unless somebody files a 11 petition for referendum, in which case that would, the issue, 12 13 assuming that the referendum requirements are properly met, that goes on the ballot then and that's when the township 14 electorate as a whole gets to vote in favor of it or against 15 it. 16 17 MR. HACH: Okay. So there is no loss of that ability for a referendum? 18 MR. LUCAS: I beg your pardon? 19 MR. HACH: There is no loss of the ability to pursue 20 21 a referendum. 22 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: No. 23 MR. LUCAS: No. I think you are thinking about it, I 24 think, prematurely. 25 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right. 26 MR. LUCAS: It doesn't go in --27 MS. PESEC: But not --28 MR. LUCAS: I am sorry. I didn't meet to interrupt 29 you, Vanessa. MS. PESEC: Go ahead, go ahead, proceed. 30 Thank you.

MR. LUCAS: Very good. You can weigh in on your 1 legal view on it. 2 MS. PESEC: That's right, that's right. 3 Okav. I think the referendum here MR. LUCAS: doesn't exist. 5 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right. 6 MR. LUCAS: The refer -- because it's, nothing 7 8 They are just recommending it. 9 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right. MR. LUCAS: If all the amendment process is approved 10 at the Trustee level after a public hearing, then the 11 referendum process begins. 12 13 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right. MR. LUCAS: Assuming, again, that the referendum 14 requirements are met, it is placed on the ballot. 15 Now, just as an editorial aside, having been legal 16 counsel here for 20 years, if there is one group of citizens 17 that knows how to mount a referendum, it's the Concord Township 18 19 residents. So -- And they're extremely experienced at it. Sometimes, as was mentioned earlier, they voted down what was 20 21 previously approved and sometimes they voted in favor of what 22 was previously approved. 23 But the important point, I think, in terms of what 24 you were asking me is, it is triggered only after the Trustees 25 complete the public hearing and then vote what they want to do with the amendments. 26 27 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right. 28 MR. LUCAS: Okav? MR. HACH: Okay. Thank you for the clarification. 29 MR. LUCAS: You are welcome. 30

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yeah, sure. Does that answer 1 your question? 2 MR. HACH: Yes. 3 MR. LUCAS: Vanessa, if you want to add anything that I have may have stated incorrectly, feel free. 5 MS. PESEC: I would just like to state that the 6 7 referendum potential dies once this zoning text is approved. 8 MR. LUCAS: Right. 9 MS. PESEC: Because all of the plans that they come in with, like a PUD, we can referendum them. But in this case, 10 all the plans that the developers come in with are not 11 referendumable per this overlay district. 12 13 MR. LUCAS: The overlay district, if it's challenged by a referendum --14 MS. PESEC: Cannot -- Right. But once it's in, when 15 a developer comes in with a plan and is approved by the 16 Trustees, it is not referendumable. 17 MR. LUCAS: That is correct. 18 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right. 19 See, I knew we'd agree. 20 MS. PESEC: 21 MR. LUCAS: I feel like I'm going to sleep like a 22 baby. 23 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. So, at this point, we 24 are going to end the public discussion part of this public 25 Do youhave -- Does anybody on the Board have any 26 questions at this point or anything they would like to discuss further? Rich? 27 28 MR. PETERSON: No, I really don't. As I mentioned, the residents I have talked to have all been in favor of it. 29 30 I've had residents actually call me to tell me they were in

favor of it. So the negativity that I heard came via emails 1 that were sent to me. That's all. 2 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Gerry. 3 MR. PETERSON: And I do want to say one thing. I am not saying you can't develop that industrial. I am just 5 saying --6 MR. MONROE: Okay, good. 7 8 MR. PETERSON: I want to make that clear. MR. MONROE: That's what I heard. 9 MR. PETERSON: No. It's been zoned, it's been zoned 10 that way for so long, it just hasn't happened. And unless you 11 know something that I don't, I don't think there is anything on 12 13 the horizon. MR. MONROE: We could argue why that's the case. 14 MR. PETERSON: Okav. 15 MR. MONROE: But I will leave that for another day. 16 MR. PETERSON: Okay. But just I want to be clear. 17 18 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: MR. MORGAN: I have nothing. 19 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Morgan, any comments? 20 21 MR. McINTOSH: No, I think, other than the things I 22 said earlier. I will say that I also received some phone calls 23 and some communication in walking my dog in my neighborhood, 24 all in favor of what we're doing. I was told that it was, a 25 couple times, that it was forward thinking and so forth. So I 26 have, I have heard some support in addition to the opposition I 27 heard tonight. 28 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Frank, any comments? MR. SCHINDLER: Well, I did get a phone call and the 29

gentleman asked me to enter his name into the minutes as a

matter of record. It was a Dan Melik, lives on Winchell Road, 1 and he is in favor of the township center. 2 MR. PETERSON: That's Dan Lilly. 3 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yeah. MR. SCHINDLER: Lilly? 5 MR. PETERSON: Lilly. 6 MR. SCHINDLER: Well, I couldn't tell on my answering 7 8 machine, so sorry about that. But you know him, okay. that's what it is and that's who it is. 9 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Mike? 10 MR. LUCAS: No. Oh, sorry. 11 12 (Whereupon, brief discussion was held off the 13 record.) CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. Are there any other 14 comments from the Board members regarding this proposal? 15 Anybody else have anything to say? 16 17 I've kind of held off, listened a little bit to everybody, and I have some pretty strong opinions on this 18 19 issue, too. I've been in the township for getting on 30 years, twenty -- '88, we moved in, so next year it will be 30 years. 20 21 And I too have seen quite a bit of change in the township and 22 some of it's been good. I think, for the most part, it's been 23 good. 24 And when I see these issues come up, it always 25 becomes a very contentious issue because, obviously, people 26 become very interested. When things involve, like, "high 27 density" gets thrown around and development and more people, it 28 becomes very contentious. And I've been on the Zoning Commission for almost 20 29

years, so I've got a lot of experience with handling these

types of issues and dealing with this. And I can say, you know, quite frankly, that everything that we've ever done as a Board has always been, you know, with the best interest of the township in mind. We don't think locally based on different housing developments or, you know, people that are going to be, that are going to be around the particular area that are going to be affected. We try to think of it as an entire township.

And when we come to these decisions, it is not something that we just take lightly. I think we deliberate a lot. We have a very hard working zoning staff that puts together a lot of information, does a ton of research, provides us with credible amounts of information so that we can, you know, deliberate this in a, in a fair way and give deference to all the different opinions on this. And we openly discuss this and there's a lot of things that we discuss and we don't always agree. We just don't. I mean, sometimes we have split decisions on this stuff.

I think, you know, in this case, I think it's very clear. You know, I mean, you can't always take the loud, the loud minority that wants to voice their opinions and say that that represents the entire feeling of the township. It always doesn't. There is a lot of people that live in the township, 16 -- what is it, 16,000 or what --

MR. PETERSON: Nineteen.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Nineteen thousand people live in the township now and we've had 80 or 90 people here tonight. That hardly represents the majority. Okay? And we run in the same -- We tend to run in the same circles with people that think like us, so a lot of times we don't hear other, you know, dissenting opinions. So we just -- We think that, you know,

what we think everybody else thinks and that's not always necessarily the case.

But, you know, I have some concerns about this development, I really do. And some of the housing component of this bothers me. I am not real in favor of that. I would rather see the development stand on its own merits based on the development of the property and with the retail component without the residential. However, I see that point of the argument with -- and it's a pretty clear trend that's developing for including the housing component to go along with all the other parts of the development.

So in that regard, it's an overlay, what I consider to be an overlay. I consider it to be another tool for the, for the township. And I think that, for the most part, even though I have a lot of reservations and I think that there has been some good points that have been brought up through this process about it, I think that, overall, it's a good plan for the, for the township and I think it's a good, forward thinking plan and I think there is a lot of opportunity here for the township moving forward.

And I think that, when we have taken on these kind of projects, we have deliberated that and we have thought about the impact and I think that we've discussed that and I think the Board members here and some of the other folks at the township know where I have stand on this. I have voiced my opinion on it more than one.

So here we are. We are at a point now where we need to make a decision on this. There has been a lot of work that's gone into it. There has been a lot of discussions and we've had a public hearing now and, you know, I think we are

ready to move forward. 1 So what I would like to do right now is I would like 2 to close the public hearing. Okay? And then what I would like 3 to do is I would like to go amendment by amendment. I would like a motion with the amendment, read the amendment and then, 5 you know, move forward and vote on each one. So I will take a 6 motion to close the public hearing. 7 8 MR. McINTOSH: Mr. Chairman, I move that we close the 9 public hearing. CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: A motion has been made. 10 MR. PETERSON: I'll second. 11 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Seconded, okay. All in favor 12 of closing the public hearing say "aye." Opposed "no"? 13 MR. SCHINDLER: Opposed, no. 14 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Opposed, one opposed. Okay. 15 So we have four ayes and one nay. Let the record reflect that. 16 17 (Four aye votes, one nay vote.) Okay. So what I would like 18 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: 19 to do is, at this point, is move amendment by amendment. have 13 amendments to vote on. We'll do a voice. 20 I want to do 21 a voice roll, Heather, for each amendment. So what I'll do is 22 I will entertain a motion in the affirmative per the amendment, 23 read it, then we'll take a second and then we'll take a voice 24 vote. 25 Let's start with Amendment Number 1. I will 26 entertain a motion. 27

MR. McINTOSH: Mr. Chairman, I move to pass the Amendment 1, amendment to Zoning Resolution to establish the Innovative Site/PD Overlay District as planned development in the Section 21, and delete in its entirety Section 13.36,

28

29

```
Innovative Site/PD as a continual use in the Capital District.
1
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: A motion has been made.
2
     I have a second?
3
               MR. LUCAS: Well, Mr. Chairman, that incorporates --
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yes.
5
               MR. LUCAS: Excuse me. -- incorporates Amendment 1
6
    and Amendment 5. Amendment 1 is limited to simply establishing
7
8
     Section 21, the Innovative Site/PD Overlay District.
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay.
9
               MS. FREEMAN: No.
10
               MR. McINTOSH: Do you need me to amend that motion
11
12
    then, stopping --
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Wait a minute.
13
               MR. LUCAS: Isn't Amendment -- Heather, isn't
14
    Amendment 5 the Section 13.36?
15
               MS. FREEMAN: Amendment 1 as is Morgan stated, it's
16
    establishing Section 21 and deleting, at the same time,
17
    Section 13.36.
18
19
               MR. LUCAS:
                           Oh, okay. I apologize.
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: So we good, Mike?
20
21
               MR. LUCAS: Yep, you are good.
22
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. So we have a motion
23
    made and a second.
24
               MR. PETERSON: Second.
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: The motion has been made and
25
26
    seconded. Heather, would you call the roll?
27
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Morgan?
28
               MR. MORGAN: Yes.
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Schindler?
29
               MR. SCHINDLER: No.
30
```

```
MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Peterson?
1
               MR. PETERSON: Yes.
2
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. McIntosh?
3
               MR. McINTOSH: Yes.
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Lingenfelter?
5
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER:
6
               Amendment Number 2.
7
8
               MR. McINTOSH: Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the
9
     Zoning Map to rezone the following presently designated parcel
     numbers to the Innovative Site/PD Overlay District: Parcel
10
     Number 08-A-020-0-00-027-0, 08-A-020-0-0-00-022-0,
11
     08-A-020-0-00-020-0, 08-A-020-0-006-0, and the same parcel
12
13
     number all the way up to the last four digits would be 021-0,
     and then following into the same last four 00-0 -- or 007-0,
14
     then 08-A-777-0-00-028-0, then the following same as the
15
     previous with the following four being 027-0, and then
16
     08-A-020-A-00-015-0, 08-A-020-A-00-014-0, and then the same
17
     again as the last four being 008-0, and again the same last
18
     four being 013-0, and then 08-A-777-0-00-029-0, and
19
     08-A-020-A-00-005-0, and a portion of 08-A-020-A-00-010-0
20
     further as described in Exhibit A.
21
22
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. A motion has been
23
     made. Can I have a second?
24
               MR. PETERSON: Second.
25
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Motion has been made and
26
     seconded. Heather, call the roll, please.
27
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Peterson?
28
               MR. PETERSON: Yes.
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Schindler?
29
               MR. SCHINDLER: No.
30
```

```
MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Morgan?
1
               MR. MORGAN:
                            Yes.
2
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. McIntosh?
3
               MR. McINTOSH: Yes.
4
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Lingenfelter?
5
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER:
6
               Amendment Number 3.
7
8
               MR. PETERSON: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion to
     approve Amendment Number 3. Revise Section 5.02 to include new
9
    definitions for terms related to parking and revise others.
10
               MR. MORGAN:
                            Second.
11
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: I have a second.
                                                          Second has
12
13
    been made. Heather, call the roll.
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Lingenfelter?
14
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yes.
15
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. McIntosh?
16
17
               MR. McINTOSH: Yes.
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Peterson?
18
19
               MR. PETERSON: Yes.
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Schindler?
20
21
               MR. SCHINDLER: Yes.
22
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Morgan?
23
               MR. MORGAN:
                            Yes.
24
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. Amendment Number 4.
               MR. PETERSON: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion to
25
26
     approve Amendment Number 4. Revise Section 11.01 to require
27
     zoning permits for porches and retaining walls that require a
28
    permit from the Building Department. Revise to include
     reorganization of the existing sections and headings.
29
30
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. A motion has been
```

```
made. Can I have a second?
1
               MR. MORGAN: Second.
2
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Motion has been made and
3
     seconded. Heather, call the roll, please.
 4
5
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. McIntosh?
               MR. McINTOSH: Yes.
6
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Peterson?
7
               MR. PETERSON: Yes.
8
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Schindler?
9
               MR. SCHINDLER: Yes.
10
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Morgan?
11
               MR. MORGAN: Yes.
12
13
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Lingenfelter?
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yes.
14
15
               Amendment Number 5.
               MR. PETERSON: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion to
16
17
     approve Amendment 5. Revise Sections 13.07, 13.08, 13.11,
     13.12, 13.16 to reference compliance with all parking
18
19
     regulations in Section 29. Revise Sections 13.17, 13.25,
     13.26, and 13.28 for compliance with the waiting space
20
21
     requirements in Section 29.
22
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: I have a motion made.
23
               MR. McINTOSH: Second.
24
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Seconded. Heather, call the
25
     roll, please.
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Peterson?
26
               MR. PETERSON: Yes.
27
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Schindler?
28
               MR. SCHINDLER: Yes.
29
30
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Morgan?
```

```
MR. MORGAN: Yes.
1
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. McIntosh?
2
               MR. McINTOSH: Yes.
3
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Lingenfelter?
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yes.
5
               Amendment Number 6.
6
               MR. PETERSON: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion to
7
8
     approve Amendment Number 6. Revise Section 15.03(I) to require
     that all residential districts comply with the parking
9
     regulations in Section 29. Modify Section 15.05 to clarify
10
     that minimum "residential" floor area and enclosed parking
11
     requirements are set forth in Table 15.05-1, and enclosed off-
12
13
     street parking is regulated in Section 29.
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: I have a motion made.
14
               MR. McINTOSH: Second.
15
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Seconded. Heather, call the
16
17
     roll.
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Peterson?
18
19
               MR. PETERSON: Yes.
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Schindler?
20
21
               MR. SCHINDLER: Yes.
22
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Morgan?
23
               MR. MORGAN: Yes.
24
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. McIntosh?
               MR. McINTOSH: Yes.
25
26
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Lingenfelter?
27
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yes.
               Amendment Number 7.
28
               MR. McINTOSH: Mr. Chairman, I move, I move for
29
     Amendment 7. Revise Section 16.07(C) to reference Section 13
30
```

for the conditional use permit for a commercial center, and 1 site plan review is required for a commercial center. Modify 2 Section 16.08 and 16.09 to require a commercial center in a PUD 3 to meet the requirements of Section 29, Off-Street Parking. 4 Revise zoning permit process in Section 16.15 to reference 5 Section 11. Clarify Section 16.16 for minor or major 6 7 modifications to an improved development plan. Revise 8 Section 16.24(C)(4) to require a landscape plan to be submitted 9 for any open during disturbed -- disturbed area during construction. 10 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: I have a motion made. 11 MR. PETERSON: Second. 12 13 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Seconded. Heather, call the roll, please. 14 MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Schindler? 15 MR. SCHINDLER: No. 16 17 MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Morgan? MR. MORGAN: Yes. 18 19 MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Lingenfelter? CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: 20 21 MS. FREEMAN: Mr. McIntosh? 22 MR. McINTOSH: Yes. 23 MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Peterson? 24 MR. PETERSON: Yes. CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. Amendment Number 8. 25 MR. PETERSON: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion to 26 approve Amendment Number 8. Revise Section 22.03 to remove 27 28 drive-thru facilities, Innovative Site/PD Townhouses and 29 Live/Work Units as conditional uses within the Capital 30 District. Revise Section 22.09 to include regulations for

```
maintenance of unimproved areas, watercourses and stormwater
1
     facilities. Delete Section 22.10 Capital District Standards.
2
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: We have a motion made.
3
               MR. McINTOSH: Second.
4
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Seconded. Heather, call the
5
     roll.
6
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. McIntosh?
7
8
               MR. McINTOSH: Yes.
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Peterson?
9
               MR. PETERSON: Yes.
10
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Schindler?
11
               MR. SCHINDLER: No.
12
13
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Morgan?
               MR. MORGAN: Yes.
14
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Lingenfelter?
15
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yes.
16
17
               Amendment Number 9.
               MR. McINTOSH: Mr. Chairman, I move to pass
18
19
    Section -- Amendment Number 9. Revise Section 29.01 to add new
    purpose statements related to green infrastructure, reducing
20
21
     impervious surfaces in parking areas. Revise Section 29.02
22
    Applicability, 29.03 General Standards, 29.04 Off-Street
23
    Parking, and 29.05 Alternative Parking Options, 29.06 Parking
24
    Lot Designation Standards, 29.07 Parking Lot Access Drive
    Regulations, and 29.08 Bicycle Parking and Waiting Space
25
26
    Requirements.
27
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: I have a motion made.
28
               MR. PETERSON: Second.
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Seconded. Heather, call the
29
30
     roll, please.
```

```
MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Morgan?
1
               MR. MORGAN: Yes.
2
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Schindler?
3
               MR. SCHINDLER: Yes.
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Peterson?
5
               MR. PETERSON: Yes.
6
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. McIntosh?
7
8
               MR. McINTOSH: Yes.
               MS. FREEMAN: And Mr. Lingenfelter?
9
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yes.
10
               Amendment Number 10.
11
               MR. PETERSON: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion to
12
13
    approve Amendment Number 10. Revise Section 34.02 to require
    that all properties not agriculturally exempt to obtain a
14
     zoning permit for construction of fences.
15
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: I have a motion made.
16
17
               MR. McINTOSH: Second.
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Seconded. Heather, call the
18
19
    roll, please.
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Peterson?
20
21
               MR. PETERSON: Yes.
22
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Schindler?
               MR. SCHINDLER: Yes.
23
24
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Morgan?
               MR. MORGAN: Yes.
25
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. McIntosh?
26
               MR. McINTOSH: Yes.
27
28
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Lingenfelter?
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yes.
29
               Amendment Number 11.
30
```

```
MR. McINTOSH: Mr. Chairman, I approve -- make a
1
     motion to approve Amendment 11. Revise Section 36.03 to
2
     require all site plans to be reviewed by Zoning Commission.
3
     Revise Section 36.04 Required Site Plan to be Submitted.
 4
     Section 36.09 Significance of an Approval for Final Site Plan.
5
     Revise Section 36.11 to add new standards for minor and major
6
     modifications.
7
8
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: I have a motion made.
9
               MR. MORGAN: I'll second.
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Seconded. Heather, call the
10
     roll, please.
11
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. McIntosh?
12
13
               MR. McINTOSH: Yes.
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Peterson?
14
               MR. PETERSON: Yes.
15
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Schindler?
16
17
               MR. SCHINDLER: Yes.
18
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Morgan?
19
               MR. MORGAN: Yes.
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Lingenfelter?
20
21
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yes.
22
               Amendment Number 12.
               MR. PETERSON: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion to
23
     approve Amendment 12. Revise Section 37 to include references
24
     to the IS/PD Overlay District. Include new Sections 37.06,
25
     Pedestrian Facilities and Section 37.07 Maximum Setback and
26
27
     Wall Orientation for "Concord Circle" Frontages.
28
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: A Motion made.
               MR. McINTOSH: Second.
29
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Seconded. Heather, call the
30
```

```
roll, please.
1
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. McIntosh?
2
               MR. McINTOSH: Yes.
3
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Peterson?
5
               MR. PETERSON: Yes.
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Schindler?
6
               MR. SCHINDLER: Yes.
7
8
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Morgan?
               MR. MORGAN: Yes.
9
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Lingenfelter?
10
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yes.
11
               Okay. Amendment Number 13.
12
13
               MR. McINTOSH: Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve
    Amendment 13. Revise Section 38.02 Applicability,
14
15
    Section 38.03 General Requirements, Section 38.05 Interior
    Parking Lot Guidelines, and other sections to refer to the
16
17
    IS/PD Overlay District.
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: I have a motion made.
18
19
               MR. PETERSON: Second.
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Seconded. Heather, call the
20
21
    roll, please.
22
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Lingenfelter?
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yes.
23
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. McIntosh?
24
               MR. McINTOSH: Yes.
25
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Peterson?
26
               MR. PETERSON: Yes.
27
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Schindler?
28
               MR. SCHINDLER: Yes.
29
30
               MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Morgan?
```

MR. MORGAN: Yes. 1 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. That wraps up that 2 part of the public hearing. We will forward this on, right, to 3 the Trustees? 4 MR. LUCAS: Wraps up the public meeting in terms of 5 that on the agenda. 6 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. All right. Number --7 8 Item Number 2, correspondence report by the Zoning Commission members. Any correspondence? 9 MR. PETERSON: Only those that I have already 10 11 discussed. CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right. Gerry? 12 13 MR. MORGAN: I have none. MR. McINTOSH: The ones I have previously mentioned. 14 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right. Frank? 15 MR. SCHINDLER: And my phone call I mentioned. 16 17 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yeah. Mr. Lilly called me also. We had a conversation. 18 19 MR. SCHINDLER: Oh, he did? CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yeah. He said he was going 20 21 to call everybody. 22 MR. SCHINDLER: Yeah. CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: He wasn't sure if he was 23 24 going to be able to make it tonight, so he said that he voiced 25 his favor, in favor of the zoning text and said that he was 26 going do reach out to rest of the Zoning Commission as well. 27 think he said he had already talked to a couple of the 28 Trustees. So we are all squared away there. So that was the only call. That was the only call I got. I didn't receive any 29

other correspondence, which was kind of surprising to me.

MR. SCHINDLER: Yeah, me too. 1 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: I was really thinking I was 2 going to get inundated with questions and phone calls and I 3 didn't really hear much of anything from anybody. I was kind 4 of surprised. 5 So Item Number 3 on the agenda is the approval of the 6 minutes of the July 11, 2017, meeting. 7 8 MR. PETERSON: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion to approve the minutes of the July 11, 2017, meeting as written. 9 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: A motion has been made. 10 MR. MORGAN: Second. 11 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Seconded. All in favor say 12 "aye." Opposed? None opposed. Let the record reflect the 13 vote. 14 (Five aye votes, no nay votes.) 15 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Item Number 4 on the agenda, 16 the next meeting for the Zoning Commission will be September 5, 17 2017. You good with that? Do we have any items coming up, 18 19 Heather? MS. FREEMAN: Not as of now, no, we don't have any 20 21 items. 22 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: We could have saved some of 23 this for the next meeting. See, we shot it all tonight. 24 All right. So with that said, I appreciate all the 25 people that came tonight and gave their input, the citizens of 26 the township, and I appreciate the opportunity to chair this 27 meeting and we will adjourn. Thank you. 28 (Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 10:40 p.m.) 29

STATE OF OHIO 1 CERTIFICATE COUNTY OF CUYAHOGA 2 I, Melinda A. Melton, Registered Professional 3 Reporter, a notary public within and for the State of Ohio, duly commissioned and qualified, do hereby certify that, to 4 the best of my ability, the foregoing proceeding extension reduced by me to stenotype shorthand, subsequently 5 transcribed into typewritten manuscript; and that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of said 6 proceedings so taken as aforesaid. 7 I do further certify that this proceeding took place at the time and place as specified in the foregoing 8 caption and extension completed without adjournment. 9 I do further certify that I am not a friend, relative, or counsel for any party or otherwise interested 10 in the outcome of these proceedings. 11 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal of office this 30th day of August 2017. 12 13 14 15 16 Melinda A. Melton 17 Registered Professional Reporter 18 Notary Public within and for the State of Ohio 19 My Commission Expires: 20 February 4, 2018 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30