## CONCORD TOWNSHIP ZONING COMMISSION LAKE COUNTY, OHIO REGULAR MEETING

Concord Town Hall 7229 Ravenna Road Concord, Ohio 44077

September 5, 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

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

7:03 p.m.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Good evening. I would like to call this Concord Township Zoning Commission meeting to order. Today is Tuesday, September 25th. We have a relatively short agenda. What?

MR. McINTOSH: The 5th, not the 25th.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Did I say the 25th?

MR. McINTOSH: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: I thought I said the 5th. I stand corrected. Correct the record, September 5th.

The number one item on the agenda was a staff update with the Trustee Resolution 2017-25. Heather, would you like to give us a little review?

MS. FREEMAN: Good evening. I know that you are aware of the resolution that was passed by the Trustees on their August 7th meeting. And in your packets, you found an official copy of that Trustee Resolution 2017-25, which in essence repealed the previous resolution that initiated all the zoning amendments related to the creation of the Innovative Site/Plan Development Overlay District and all the other ancillary amendments that went along with that, which basically stopped the public hearing process and made that moot.

As you are aware, there were several other amendments that this Board was working on that had nothing to do with the Innovative Site/PD. So I just, you know, wanted to mention that, at some point, if the Board wants to move forward and relook at some of those, the other items that weren't related to that, that we can do that over the next several months.

Staff also had some suggestions on some other areas that we may want to look at in the existing Zoning Resolution,

one of them had to do with the Town Hall Neighborhood and Town Hall Commons zoning districts. The text went into effect in 2009. And I just briefly, you know, I printed off just copies in case you wanted to take a look at that. The text went into effect in 2009 and the property was rezoned in 2010, and that's virtually at this intersection where we sit, at Ravenna and 608.

There hasn't been a lot of activity in the area over the last seven, eight years in relationship to those properties that are currently zoned the Town Hall Commons and Neighborhood. And just briefly looking at the purpose statements, the Town Hall Commons was to preserve and enhance the historic center of the township at the Concord-Hambden/Ravenna Road crossroads area in order to provide a mixture of community facilities, businesses and recreational uses that serve as a gathering place for the community. I think we have a good, good base there with our Town Hall Campus and community facilities that we provide.

And then the Town Hall Neighborhood is the area that's surrounding the historic center, and the purpose of that was to allow for selected community-oriented businesses and residential uses while promoting the emerging land use patterns.

We've had some -- There is some land that's currently on the market now in the Town Hall Neighborhood District. Some of the uses that some of the people that have contacted our office had discussed trying to do there, one of them was kind of a unique use. I've never heard this before but he referred to it as a boutique winery or also known as kind of like an urban winery. It wouldn't necessarily fall under the

agricultural use because the person that was interested in looking at the property was going to purchase the grapes and/or the juice off site, have it transported there, and then was hoping to be able to produce and manufacture the wine in an accessory building that's currently on the lot. And then they wanted to repurpose, like, the house that's there -- it's a nonconforming house -- to allow for a tasting room on the first floor of the house and actually live on the second story. This was like this grand idea of, you know, can I do this type of thing? Obviously, that's not something that's, that's permitted in the Zoning Resolution.

Some other ideas that people have asked to do were more residential related. We've got approached by someone who was looking to hope to do -- maybe rezone it to allow for some kind of independent living. I am pretty sure you guys have heard, over the, over the last ten years, different pitches from different organizations looking to rezone and do some kind of residential uses on the property that's owned by Osborne across from -- on 608 across from Quail Hollow.

But not trying to change anything based on those specific requests or anything but if you just were to look at the Table of Uses within both the Town Hall districts, it does seem a little restrictive as far as what folks could do there. Like the Town Hall Neighborhood, your main uses that would be permitted are your medical and dental offices, administrative/ professional offices. There are some conditional uses for restaurants, personal services, bed and breakfast and then you can, I mean, you can read it. I am not going to go through and read it.

It's a little light, so it's just something that, you

know, if we were maybe -- if the Commission wanted to look at it, we'd be, staff would be happy to work with you and we can maybe evaluate what, what uses are there and maybe suggest some modifications to allow for some additional uses.

Then just one other area that I know we've brought up to you in the past about having to do with the sign regulations, due to the fact the Supreme Court case Reed versus The Town of Gilbert, there has been a little bit more case law on that and a little bit more guidance from the attorneys that kind of review these things. And I was going to have Sydney speak a couple minutes on what we need to maybe look at in our current sign regulations as another future amendment, so I will give her a minute or two or however long it takes.

MS. MARTIS: Hello. So as Heather stated, one of the sections that we were looking to maybe make some modifications to were the sign regulations and hope to make them more content neutral and in line with the current legislation that has come out and different court cases. So some of the sections specifically that should be addressed in our sign section is the purpose clause, some of the regulations pertaining to the illumination criteria of electronic message centers and especially the regulation of temporary signs.

And so if the Zoning Commission would like, we could review our current sign regulations and study them and maybe come forth with some recommendation in the future and give you some more detailed information about the sections that need to be reviewed, if that's something that you would like to address in the future.

MS. FREEMAN: Okay. That's just some other things that we could work on, some ideas that staff had. So,

obviously, we just got off a very hot, contentious potential, you know, amendment, so we're in no hurry to start something new if you need a little --

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: No.

MS. FREEMAN: We are open for any ideas, suggestions that you have.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: You know what I think would be a good idea, Heather? I think the visitation or the revisiting of the Town Hall Neighborhood and Town Hall Commons would be a good idea because, like you said, those were passed back in 2009. I mean, it's now 2017, rapidly approaching 2018. That's almost ten years, you know. I think it might be a good idea to go back and revisit these and take a look at some of the conditional, permitted and accessory uses and make it, you know, maybe -- like you said, it's pretty narrow -- maybe take a look at it, maybe expand on it a little bit, you know, based on some of the requests we've had.

MS. FREEMAN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: It might not be a bad idea to take a look at that again. And the other thing I think would be prudent would be to -- anything that we did work wise moving up to the most recent overlay district for over on Discovery Lane that would be appropriate for our zoning text outside of that, I think we should definitely tighten those things up and get those adopted in the zoning text. I mean, we did the work.

MS. FREEMAN: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: The text has been written. I mean, there is no reason to just leave those go. I mean, if they're independent of, you know, the overlay district, you know, regulations, then I think we should probably, you know,

take a look at those and get those put into the text.

There was a lot of good -- I thought there was a lot of good work and text that was written, a lot of deliberation that was done on a lot of those issues. I think we shouldn't just let that just fall on the wayside. I think we should pick up on that and take whatever we can, pick up whatever pieces, you know, are salvageable out of that and --

MS. FREEMAN: Right.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: -- get that put into the text. And if something happens and, again, this thing revisits at some point in time down the road or whatever happens, that part will be done. It will be just that much less work we will have to do to get everything squared away.

So I think that would be a good idea. I would like to see a list of those regulations that you think are most appropriate that we can get passed, we can get those on the agenda, do a couple quick work sessions just to refresh everybody's memory, maybe a work session, plow through it and then maybe schedule a public hearing for it and get that stuff adopted into the zoning text. Yes? No? Sound like a good idea to you?

MS. FREEMAN: Yeah, I mean, if it's the consensus on the Board.

MR. MORGAN: Sure.

MR. McINTOSH: I think we, obviously, we did a lot of good work on that. And I think, if you kind of go through everything that -- some of the objections and a lot of the stuff we heard from residents, you know, they -- a lot of concern about how we develop. Well, what was lost in the mud of a lot of what we heard was -- you know, there were a lot of

things that were in there, you know -- while there was objection to a couple lightening rod points, there was a lot of stuff in there that I think, honestly, people understood it's the kind of thing that's going to keep a lot of chief complaints they had about development and growth in the township that's going to -- it's going to deal with a lot of concerns people have about how, how things come into the township.

And agree with Andy. I don't think we want to lose that work because, the overlay district aside, those are important things as far as maintaining continuity and standards within the township. So I think we should absolutely do that.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yeah, I think we touched on a lot of really good stuff there, you know. I think we should try to fit that in wherever we can, if it makes sense.

MR. PETERSON: I have a question on signs, Heather.

About four years ago maybe, Kathy Mitchell put together a

little committee to work on sign regulation updates. I think

you were with me, weren't -- Frank and I were on that.

MS. FREEMAN: Okay.

MR. PETERSON: There were a couple other people, we had an outside consultant and we went through all the sign standards and we benchmarked other communities and we put together all new sign standards. I think they made it into our regulations, didn't they?

MS. FREEMAN: They are.

MR. PETERSON: About four years ago?

MS. FREEMAN: Yeah, they are. So they are really, you know, they are -- Like, we have a really good base for the sign regs.

1 MR. PETERSON: Yeah. So we just have to take --

MS. FREEMAN: There are just a few areas that we need to pay attention to.

MR. PETERSON: Okay.

MS. FREEMAN: Specifically like the temporary signs.

MR. PETERSON: Right.

MS. FREEMAN: If you have to read the sign to know how to regulate it, then it's content based. So if you are calling a sign a real estate sign and you're giving it different regulations than maybe a temporary special event sign, you have to read the face of the sign to know how to regulate it, which will be thrown out, you know. That will be subject to strict scrutiny by the court system.

MR. PETERSON: Okay.

MS. FREEMAN: Which hardly anything would ever pass that. So we need to be a little bit, you know -- We need to call it a yard sign. And then how many yard signs should one be allowed to have on a particular type of property, and where should it be located? So you can regulate time, place and, like, time, place and manner. Like how many? Where at?

MR. McINTOSH: When we finished that work, I think, years ago, then shortly right after we passed it, then the Gilbert decision came down.

MS. FREEMAN: Right.

MR. McINTOSH: Correct me. I don't remember. But I believe that we kind of said we wanted to just -- Because it became apparent that there were things in our text that were, all of the sudden, we needed to change.

MS. FREEMAN: Yeah.

MR. McINTOSH: But Sidney mentioned there had been --

or you guys both mentioned there had been expanded case law?

MS. FREEMAN: There has been some, yeah.

MR. McINTOSH: Since then.

MS. FREEMAN: Yeah.

MR. McINTOSH: I think we were waiting for that to filter down to see before we went ahead and tried to overreact to it and anticipate things that hadn't been determined yet. So you're saying we've had a little mileage on that and there is some direction now?

MS. FREEMAN: I think a little bit more. We can look at it to make sure of that, you know. Obviously, we'd work with our legal counsel and we may want to do some kind of outreach to some of -- I think what we see from an enforcement standpoint, some of the businesses in Concord may need or they've been asking for the ability to do a little bit more when it relates to temporary signs. So, right now, we limit it no more than one, no more than 45 days a year. But a lot of the churches, they tend to have a lot more, like, events or festivals where they're, they're asking to put up the sign for longer than the maximum 45 days. They might only want to do one but the time frame might not meet their standards.

So we may want to do a little bit of homework, like, gauging what, you know, how much signage, temporary signs like communities, you know, businesses need versus churches and, I mean, the residential. It's not going to be easy to know the number, and especially when it comes up to election time and whether or not we can even touch those, you know.

MR. McINTOSH: Okav.

MS. FREEMAN: Okay. Do you think we should -- Do you want to maybe work on the stuff we already worked on and look

at the Town Hall and maybe wait a little bit on the sign stuff 1 and do that separate? We can, kind of, do that, look into that 2 a little bit more in the background and we're not ready to --3 We don't need to do everything at once, obviously. 4 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yeah. 5 MS. FREEMAN: It's just kind of a hierarchy of 6 7 things. 8 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yeah. Where we have lots of 9 work already done, let's focus on those first, kind of knock those off. And then as we're knocking those off, you can start 10 putting more meat on the bone on some of the other things that 11 are still -- need a little bit of work to be done. 12 13 MS. FREEMAN: Okay. CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: That way, we can kind of 14 knock those off as you're ready to present them to the Board. 15 MS. FREEMAN: 16 Okav. 17 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: And we'll get them, you know, everything squared away. 18 19 MR. McINTOSH: Is there anything pressing on the Town Hall stuff that you're --20 21 MS. FREEMAN: No, no, no. It was just I know I look 22 at the uses and when I talk to residents and people looking at 23 the properties, it seems quite limiting. I don't see the 24 retail and the restaurant happening over here so much --25 MR. McINTOSH: Right. 26 MS. FREEMAN: -- as a stand-alone use. I mean, it 27 just doesn't get the visibility that the corridor does, the 28 Auburn-Crile. And based on what people are asking to do over

there, it sounds like there might be a different use that, you

29

30

know --

MR. McINTOSH: That goes back to early in my days when I started when we did the Town Hall stuff, but it seemed to me that was, kind of, also we were going to put that up and sort of see what happened or didn't happen. So the fact that you're at a crossroads is not a surprise. I think we kind of almost expected that just to --

MS. FREEMAN: Right. And from what I understand, too, there were -- there was some additional uses in the Town Hall District that didn't get approved as part of the amendment process.

MR. McINTOSH: Right, yeah.

MS. FREEMAN: And I haven't gone back to look to see exactly what that was but I will probably do a little bit of research and see originally what we, kind of, what we --

MR. McINTOSH: There was a lot of vagueness to it. I know it wasn't real specific. I think we were trying to just be general open door and wait and see what walked up. It sounds like you've had some poking around, so maybe that will help guide some focus.

MS. FREEMAN: Yeah, okay.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Thanks, Heather.

MS. FREEMAN: Sure. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: So then we will enter into the record the Trustees' Resolution Number 2017-25 that was highlighted by Heather as Number 1 on the agenda as far as the resolution is concerned. So that's, that's a part of the -- We will make that a part of the record.

Item Number 2 on the agenda this evening is a correspondence report by Zoning Commission members. Rich, anything to report?

MR. PETERSON: Nothing official. 1 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Gerry? 2 MR. MORGAN: No correspondence. 3 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Frank? MR. SCHINDLER: Nothing. 5 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Nothing. 6 MR. McINTOSH: Nothing official. 7 8 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Nothing, okay. I got some phone calls, you know. After the, after the zoning meeting we 9 had, I had a couple residents who called and wanted to know why 10 things, kind of, went the way they did and were a little 11 disappointed that we weren't able to get that to go through. 12 13 They were really hopeful that we could get the, you know, get the resolution that we had in front of us implemented but, you 14 know, it wasn't meant to be. So that was, pretty much, I had 15 just a couple phone calls from a couple residents that were 16 asking what was going on. I had a couple casual, you know, 17 run-intos with a couple of residents and they asked me about 18 what was going on. So that was it for me. 19 Item Number 3 on the agenda is the approval of the 20 21 minutes of the August 1, 2017, meeting. Take a look at them, a 22 lot of them. 23 MR. McINTOSH: Mr. Chairman, I move that we accept 24 the minutes from August 1st meeting. MR. PETERSON: I'll second. 25 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: The motion is made and 26 27 seconded. All those in favor say "aye." Opposed say "nay." 28 (Five aye votes, no nay votes.) 29 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: No nays, all ayes, motion carries. 30

Okay. Item Number 4 on the agenda is the next 1 meeting of the Zoning Commission, which would be October 3rd. 2 Heather, do you have anything pressing coming up? 3 MS. FREEMAN: No, there is nothing on the agenda as of yet. 5 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: As of yet, okay. 6 7 MS. FREEMAN: There shouldn't be any site plan 8 reviews, no. CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: It's going to be pretty 9 10 clear. MS. FREEMAN: What's that? 11 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: It's going to be pretty, 12 pretty clear. 13 MS. FREEMAN: We could have a work session, you know, 14 if you like. 15 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yeah. I'd like to take 16 advantage of any free time that we have to get those work 17 sessions under way and get that, those text additions or 18 amendments or whatever, you know, hammered out so we can get 19 that put into the Zoning Resolution. That would be a good 20 21 idea. 22 MR. SCHINDLER: Mr. Chairman, I have a question. 23 Heather, what you are going to start working on, how 24 much of the public hearing we had that night is going to affect 25 your input? Is there going to be a lot of things, based on the 26 screaming and yelling that was here that night, that you're 27 going to revisit because of, because of what was brought up? 28 MS. FREEMAN: I'm sorry. Well, I think most of the opposition had to do with the Innovative Site/Plan Development 29

30

Overlay and nothing else.

MR. SCHINDLER: Right.

MS. FREEMAN: It was almost as if we weren't doing all the other eleven amendments. I don't recall one comment specific other than from the Planning Commission. So, I mean, based on what Andy said, if we could just go back and look at what we worked on that did not include any changes to the Innovative Site/Plan Development or the Capital District -- And that's what you would like us to potentially move forward with, right?

MR. SCHINDLER: So if we get this reworked and actually get it into some workable form or is already in a workable form, just get it incorporated, this should address a lot of things that were brought up at that night, that screaming and yelling?

MS. FREEMAN: Well, what do you mean?

CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: I don't think so.

MR. MORGAN: I don't think it will address anything. That was addressed by the Trustees --

MS. FREEMAN: Sorry.

MR. McINTOSH: Yanking.

MR. MORGAN: -- yanking, yeah, pulling the amendment, the overlay district. The other, the other issues were, you know, some -- I think you had some parking changes and some setback changes or something, you know. All the other stuff that was dealt with leading up to that, you know, with the overlay, it got kind of melded in with that because we were going through it, just have one public hearing for everything. But there was a lot of other changes, you know, everything other than the overlay.

MR. SCHINDLER: Right.

MR. MORGAN: I agree. I don't remember hearing anybody speaking in opposition or in favor of any of the other items that were discussed. It was, pretty much, everything with the overlay district and mostly with regards to the, to the residential component of it more than anything.

MR. McINTOSH: Right.

MR. SCHINDLER: Yeah, big time.

MS. FREEMAN: Right. So just to maybe refresh your memory, we had a lot of, you know, in the Definition Section, we had a lot of new definitions that related to the parking. We had some changes to Section 11 that had to do with the zoning permit.

MR. SCHINDLER: Right.

MS. FREEMAN: The zoning permit section. And then we had the changes under the Conditional Use Section 13 as it related to the waiting space requirements for, like, drive-thru facilities, gas stations, some housekeeping things in the Residential District Section.

There was a couple modifications in the existing Section 16 under the PUD. We can go over those a little more detailed if you want. If I recall, you voted no against them. I wasn't sure if there was something in there that you weren't agreeable to. We can talk about that more, you know, next month.

And then we will just have to take out some of the things that had to do with the IS/PD and just go with everything else that didn't relate to that.

MR. SCHINDLER: Okay.

MS. FREEMAN: We will just not do anything with the Capital District or, you know, change the existing IS/PD.

```
We'll go back to all the other amendments that really had
1
2
     nothing to do with that.
               MR. SCHINDLER: Okay.
3
               MS. FREEMAN: Does that help answer your question?
4
               MR. SCHINDLER: Yeah, thank you. Thank you for
5
     clarifying. Thank you.
6
               MS. FREEMAN: Okay.
7
               CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Is there anything that
8
     anybody on the Commission would like to discuss or any other
9
     issues you would like to see on upcoming agendas, anyone? No.
10
     Okay. With that, we'll adjourn the meeting.
11
12
                (Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 7:26 p.m.)
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
```

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 26th day of September 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