

CONCORD TOWNSHIP ZONING COMMISSION
LAKE COUNTY, OHIO
REGULAR MEETING

Concord Town Hall
7229 Ravenna Road
Concord, Ohio 44077

March 6, 2018
7:00 p.m.

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Zoning Commission members present:

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

Also Present:

Heather Freeman, Planning & Zoning Director/Zoning
Inspector
Stephanie Landgraf, Esq., Legal Counsel

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

1 7:01 p.m.

2 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Good evening. I would like
3 to call this Concord Township Zoning Commission meeting,
4 Tuesday, March 6, to order. We have a busy agenda this
5 evening.

6 Item Number 1 on the agenda is the Site Plan Review
7 Application Number 032 from Mr. Matthew L. Weber, agent for
8 Unistar Hospitality LLC, is requesting site plan approval for
9 a proposed hotel located at 11200 Gold Court and being
10 Permanent Parcel Number 08-A-020-B-00-004-0.

11 Is the applicant here?

12 MR. WEBER: I am.

13 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. Come on up and state
14 your name and address for the record for me, please, and give
15 us your show.

16 MR. WEBER: I will try and make this simple and
17 straightforward. Matthew Weber, Weber Engineering Services,
18 2555 Hartville Road, Rootstown, Ohio.

19 We've actually looked through the staff report and
20 it's a very thorough and concise report. It identifies pretty
21 much what we're presenting for the, for the project as a new
22 hotel at the end of a -- what is currently a vacant street, if
23 we want to call it that, or a nondeveloped -- sounds a little
24 bit better -- street. We -- It's about two and a half acres.
25 The stormwater management has been provided at the main
26 entrance for the entire development.

27 And we actually have looked through the items in the
28 report. We can comply with, with everything that is asked
29 from a conditional standpoint with, I guess, I hate to say
30 with the exception but maybe an item for discussion would be

1 Item Number 1 in the staff recommendations for the -- where
2 they identified a system of shared driveways and cross-access
3 easements to be implemented. I know that's a recent addition
4 to, I believe, your codified ordinances. We were actually not
5 aware of that at the time. It just was, it just was passed.

6 The concern that we have is really from a liability
7 standpoint, with this is a hotel. It's been our experience in
8 the industry that most of the, most of the issues come from
9 parking lots and sidewalks when it comes to lawsuits, whether
10 it's ice, snow. Obviously, in this area, we do have a lot of
11 ice and snow. And it becomes a matter of, with a shared
12 driveway, who has that responsibility, trying to come into
13 agreements with an adjacent property, come up with who is
14 responsible. Parcel A has someone that gets injured traveling
15 to Parcel B. Who is responsible for it? So from a liability
16 standpoint and the franchise, Holiday Inn Express, they are
17 asking that we not have a share driveway situation.

18 We actually went to great lengths when this was
19 being subdivided. We were kind of on the front end of this --
20 although the project has been going on for about ten years,
21 when I say "front end" of the subdivision, the recent
22 subdivision that was just recorded -- to actually purchase
23 enough land to where we could fit in a second entrance. At
24 the time, there was no, no code or request to have a shared
25 entrance. So we actually took it upon ourselves to make sure
26 that the parcel was large enough that we could fit this and
27 it, kind of, came as a, as a surprise to the project, the
28 timing of it.

29 So it really comes down to that concern of liability
30 and we are requesting that we be able to go with the plan that

1 we have before you in lieu of trying to find out a --

2 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Now, which is the driveway
3 that would indicate the shared one?

4 MR. WEBER: I am sorry. This, this would be the
5 indicated shared driveway. There is a parcel here. And,
6 ironically, we actually looked at that parcel at one time and
7 it wasn't large enough to subdivide and do things differently.
8 It would have pushed these lines and it would have changed the
9 lot. So we actually came to this side and actually worked out
10 an agreement where we're having to tear down part of the
11 existing hardware store. Part of the existing hardware store
12 will actually be demolished so that we can get the length and
13 get things that we needed for that. So this is the parcel and
14 that is parcel Sublot 3 is, I believe, is what the current,
15 current demarcation of it is.

16 So that's what we're asking. Other than that, we
17 can -- everything else, I think, we pretty much hit on the
18 money. There's a few lighting things that they want addressed
19 and a couple call-outs for the area to save some trees but
20 that's, that's the one that's really, for us, is a, I guess, a
21 tough pill to swallow in trying to do that.

22 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: So we can't -- So your
23 project would only, if you can't do the shared driveway there,
24 then the project pretty much would be unacceptable for you?
25 Is that what you're saying?

26 MR. WEBER: Well, I mean, I mean, I will have to say
27 this. As the agent, I think, maybe Anil can speak to the, to
28 the fact of whether or not it's a, it's a no-go. I think it
29 may be that we would forego that entrance altogether. But
30 again, at the same time, we intentionally went for -- We went

1 to get this parcel big enough to have the two lots. So to say
2 we would completely pull out, I know there are, are options
3 for some other areas but this is where, you know, this is
4 where we want to be. We went to great lengths to get that to
5 work and I think it may be, from a liability standpoint, we
6 would prefer to not have the entrance.

7 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Well, typically, that would
8 be a shared entrance to the next lot over?

9 MR. WEBER: Yeah. From my understanding of what the
10 intended new Resolution or -- Resolution was to the Code was
11 that the idea would have been to try and find a way to get
12 these two, whether it was straddle, whether it was here, there
13 was a connector, to find some way to get some, some continuity
14 through there so that there were no -- so you didn't have a
15 whole bunch of curb cuts, let's just say, you didn't have a
16 bunch of curb cuts through here and have, you know, clutter or
17 whatnot at the cul-de-sac.

18 So a plan over here, they can certainly have a
19 single entrance as we would have had we actually not worked to
20 get this parcel over here. Through that process, we worked to
21 split this off so we could have that but, you know, this
22 parcel was originally intended, I think, to be here and we
23 would have had just a single, a single entrance, which is what
24 the adjacent property would, too.

25 Again, from a liability standpoint, you know, in a
26 hotel you've got people coming and going and it's -- they're
27 not always -- I won't say they're not regulars. Sometimes
28 when you go to a place, you're local and you go to McDonald's
29 all the time, you know that -- you kind of know how to
30 maneuver your way and you know what the walks are like and

1 where to cross. When you have a situation where you have
2 people that are coming in visiting and they don't necessarily
3 know they're crossing over, you know, property lines and then
4 it becomes -- it just becomes a liability issue in the big
5 picture of it.

6 MR. SCHINDLER: Being in the construction business,
7 as you are --

8 MR. WEBER: Yeah.

9 MR. SCHINDLER: -- is there any way you can make
10 that driveway in such a way to make it safer in a sense that,
11 say, it's not straight, in other words, anyone that would come
12 to see it where they either would have to make some type of a
13 maneuver that they would have to slow down so it would
14 minimize the chances of an accident happening?

15 MR. WEBER: Well, and I don't, I don't think so much
16 the issue is, is speed through there. It's really a matter
17 of, you know, with snow and ice and no matter how much -- I
18 remember I did a Giant Eagle years ago and they kept the thing
19 as clean as they could possibly keep it. And it seemed like,
20 know you, everybody always wanted to have a lawsuit because it
21 was a Giant Eagle and they would slip and fall and it was
22 obviously Giant Eagle's fault that they slipped and fell.

23 This is introducing two properties. I don't know
24 that it's so much automobiles. And to be, you know, quite
25 honest with you, I don't know that that would be as big of a
26 situation as it is, just the fact that you've got two, two
27 connections that are two properties that are kind of
28 interconnected there and you've got, you know, somebody
29 decides they come in here and decide they're parking here just
30 because that happens to be where they're at but they realize

1 they're at this hotel or this, you know, this facility and
2 they walk, they're walking across and now something happens
3 right there and they are on somebody else's property when it
4 happens but yet they aren't even participating in the function
5 of this property.

6 And so it's just really -- And they have, actually,
7 there is a hotel in -- I apologize. Is it in Cranberry -- the
8 hotel in Cranberry where they were forced to do the same thing
9 and to have a shared entrance and it's been, it's been an
10 issue. It's always been a matter of how is it, how is it kept
11 clean? Who is responsible for it? You know, well, this --
12 The asphalt is getting worn up here and it just becomes
13 problematic, we'll say.

14 So from that perspective, again, we're trying to
15 say, as much effort as we went through to get it to this
16 point, we would like to see that it stay in this, this
17 function.

18 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: And the two entrances is
19 really -- you feel it's important, it's that important to have
20 the two entrances?

21 MR. WEBER: Yeah. I mean, that's, again, that's why
22 we, you know, worked hard to get that extra property and spent
23 the extra money to work that out and tear down part of a
24 building and whatnot was to be able to have that room and
25 access for the two, two entrances.

26 I think if it came down to -- If it had to be no
27 entrance, you know, if it had to be no entrance -- or just the
28 one entrance, I think that would probably be what the
29 franchise would prefer to go with, would just be, okay, we
30 will just live with the single entrance, despite the fact that

1 we spent a lot of money to do that and we probably didn't, you
2 know, didn't have to to get to that point. But that would be,
3 I think, probably the next preferred would be just a single
4 entrance, correct.

5 MR. SCHINDLER: I would think probably having the
6 single entrance, for one thing, would minimize traffic
7 concerns, for one thing. And then, again, you're talking
8 about the liability as far as somebody falling during the
9 winter months and stuff and upkeep. That would minimize,
10 needless to say, the chance of --

11 MR. WEBER: Sure, sure.

12 MR. SCHINDLER: Yeah.

13 MR. WEBER: Yeah. The thing about the, with this,
14 you know, especially with the way -- and one of the reasons
15 why we tried that is, you know, with the canopy and porte-
16 cochère, if you want to call it in the front, it allows people
17 to come in, drop off. And although we have, you know, a dual
18 function where you can, you can actually go out that way,
19 you'll find that, with that second entrance, it kind of keeps
20 the traffic away from the front of it, too, where you come in
21 and you usually, you know, you usually come in and do what I
22 do and you drop off your wife and children and do all the nice
23 things and check in and then they wait for you. But then I
24 always find, when we leave the hotel, we'll all just run out
25 together and get in the car and then we're gone.

26 So having the second entrance kind of keeps that
27 front -- or I'll call it the second, you know, entrance or
28 exit keeps that front from being congested. So that's why,
29 with this particular layout and the way this was done, we were
30 trying hard to get the second entrance with the elongated, you

1 know, with the elongated frontage there.

2 So that's, kind of, what the intent was from a, from
3 a congestion standpoint in the front. Otherwise, you're
4 pushing everybody, every time, you're going back and forth
5 through the front. And the idea is to have this full a lot,
6 right, so people are always coming in and staying at the
7 hotel, so you try to keep the traffic away.

8 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: It's kind of a single
9 purpose cul-de-sac. I don't see it's going to have a lot of
10 traffic necessarily.

11 MR. SCHINDLER: No.

12 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: It's a short -- It's
13 relatively short. Gold Court doesn't go very far back.

14 MR. SCHINDLER: Yeah.

15 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: I don't see -- I wouldn't
16 see a lot of ancillary traffic back there unless you're going
17 to the hotel, you know, I mean, or whatever other business is
18 planning on coming into those, those couple of spots. I mean,
19 curb cut wise, I don't see that it gets too out of hand for
20 that, for that area and not having, you know, not having the
21 shared, the shared drive.

22 I think it looks, I think that -- I think you're
23 right from a traffic flow standpoint. Having the two
24 entrances --

25 MR. McINTOSH: Right.

26 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: -- or one entrance/exit type
27 of thing is a, is a smart way to go.

28 Do you guys have any opinions on it?

29 MR. PETERSON: Oh, I would -- My comment would be,
30 first of all, shared driveways, I just experienced one last

1 night. It's a restaurant and a gas station. I got all --
2 Yeah, I wasn't sure where I was supposed to be, really. It
3 was confusing. I don't like those. But I do like the fact of
4 two driveways because, as you say, you drop off your luggage
5 and your family and you go over there and park. And then if
6 you are going to go out to dinner -- hopefully, these people
7 will use our local restaurants -- it makes it real easy to
8 come out the other end and not get involved in the incoming
9 guests. So I like the two entrances like that. And just as
10 my personal preference -- I know that's not the rule -- but I
11 don't like shared driveways.

12 MR. McINTOSH: I think I agree. I think we've got a
13 nice flow.

14 MR. PETERSON: Yeah.

15 MR. McINTOSH: I have experienced hotels like that.
16 I mean, I agree. You come in and then you leave. It's nice
17 having that option.

18 MR. WEBER: Right.

19 MR. McINTOSH: I think from a flow standpoint,
20 that's -- it's good. I am not overly bothered by the
21 shared -- the lack of a shared driveway either, especially
22 because we don't know what would be over there. It's kind of
23 speculative, too. So half the equation is missing. You don't
24 know what kind of traffic volume. You don't know what kind of
25 access that -- If it was something that was already there or
26 something that was coming in where we knew what was going to
27 be next, that might be a different conversation. But --

28 MR. PETERSON: Another point is safety. If we had
29 to have an emergency vehicle get in, that one driveway could
30 be blocked with traffic or something like that. It would be

1 easier always to get in a safety vehicle.

2 MR. WEBER: Right.

3 MR. MORGAN: Yeah, I don't have an objection to the
4 two driveways. I guess, the question I would have is it
5 sounds, it sounds to me like what you're saying is that the
6 Holiday Inn would probably never permit a shared driveway in
7 the future. So if that development -- I am looking at, you
8 know, you're the first person on the block.

9 MR. WEBER: Right.

10 MR. MORGAN: So, you know, if the next person coming
11 in wanted, wanted two driveways, would there be an opening for
12 them to be able to obtain an easement, an ingress/egress
13 easement on there and make that connection to that second
14 driveway in the cul-de-sac?

15 MR. WEBER: Yeah, I've got -- I mean, from the
16 liability, the liability issue of it, I would have to say it
17 would probably be a hard sell. I mean, from a, from a
18 franchise, they have certain things they look for and those
19 are the things that the franchise, you know, the franchisee
20 goes and looks for to make work on the property. And we've
21 looked at a number of different places and, again, that's why
22 we worked so hard in dealing with the existing hardware store.

23 I've got to say chances are slim that it would, that
24 it would actually -- they would come to terms and agree to an
25 easement. If it came, you know, to a matter of fire safety or
26 something like that then that's probably, you know, a bridge
27 that you could cross at that time. If, depending on what went
28 in over there, if there had to be some sort of access just
29 for, you know -- We've done them before where you have fire
30 bollards, you know, the breakdown bollards and we have done

1 things in between them where you, you don't even know that
2 it's, you don't even know it's an access way. But if, if fire
3 safety or someone had to come across there, depending on how
4 the layout was, that's something that could probably be talked
5 through. But, again, from a, from a liability standpoint, to
6 have things going back and forth through there has been our
7 biggest concern.

8 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: So if push came to shove, a
9 one, a one-driveway plan would be acceptable for you?

10 MR. WEBER: Yeah, yeah.

11 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: I mean, you wouldn't get a
12 lot of pushback from the, from the franchise to only limit it
13 to one?

14 MR. WEBER: No, I don't believe we'd have the
15 pushback from the franchise because it still gives it just --
16 it just limits the -- or limits the ability for that, what
17 we'll call the, the --

18 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yeah, it funnels all the, it
19 funnels all the traffic back --

20 MR. WEBER: It funnels it, right.

21 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: -- back in front of the,
22 back in front of the hotel where people are dropping off.
23 Yeah, I understand that creates an issue.

24 MR. WEBER: But that would be, that would be the
25 preferred, obviously. As I believe the second option would be
26 to not, not to have one. And then the last would be a matter
27 of, you know, either -- if we had to go, if we had to go to
28 that, they will actually, you know, start to reconsider this
29 parcel versus other parcels that they've looked at to see if
30 it would, would work.

1 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

2 Heather, has there been any other interest in some
3 of the other parcels that are involved back there as far as
4 other potential uses that you can, at least, give us an idea
5 if there is anything, any interest back there.

6 MS. FREEMAN: There is some interest on the parcel
7 to the north.

8 MR. WEBER: This one here.

9 MS. FREEMAN: Another commercial use.

10 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

11 MS. FREEMAN: And then also at the corner of Crile
12 and Gold Court.

13 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: That's way -- That's up
14 front though.

15 MS. FREEMAN: Yeah, that's on the other end.

16 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: So that, the curb cuts there
17 wouldn't affect what we've got going here in the cul-de-sac.

18 MS. FREEMAN: Right, yeah. And just a reminder,
19 this subdivision has five lots. So there is only one to the
20 west of here that has frontage on Crile and Gold Court and
21 then three on the north side.

22 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yeah, the dotted line is
23 the, is the existing Crile Road True Value?

24 MS. FREEMAN: Yeah. And they actually did --

25 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: I take it, the box, that
26 little --

27 MS. FREEMAN: They demoed, they demoed that back
28 half of the building last week.

29 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay.

30 MS. FREEMAN: Or you probably haven't seen it.

1 MR. WEBER: No. I went to see it but it was gone.
2 It wasn't there. I didn't see anything.

3 MS. FREEMAN: Yeah. And just to confirm, you know,
4 what Matt said, they did purchase basically almost an
5 additional lot in order to, to get the 2.4 acres. I know when
6 Route 44 LLC was originally designing the subdivision, even
7 when they platted it, actually, your clients acquired another
8 .78 acres of land in order to accommodate the project to get
9 the layout that they have now.

10 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

11 MS. FREEMAN: So quite a bit more land in order to
12 move forward with this.

13 MR. WEBER: They weren't giving it away.

14 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: They weren't?

15 MR. WEBER: They weren't, no, they weren't giving it
16 away.

17 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: I can't imagine.

18 MR. WEBER: A little more in engineering fees.

19 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Heather, do you have any,
20 any input on that with the shared driveway aspect or what's
21 your thoughts?

22 MS. FREEMAN: Well, being that it is a short road,
23 limited number of parcels, and just the fact that they, you
24 know, acquired the additional land in order to try to
25 accommodate the two, I guess staff feels like it might create
26 a hardship for them, being the fact that they have done the
27 due diligence in trying to make it, you know, fit.

28 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

29 MS. FREEMAN: And with this coming in at the last
30 minute.

1 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right, yeah, it's kind of a
2 timing issue.

3 MR. MORGAN: And I think, if I remember correctly,
4 our discussions about the shared driveway were more dealing
5 with main roads --

6 MS. FREEMAN: Yeah.

7 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

8 MR. MORGAN: -- than the small cul-de-sac like this
9 with a few lots on it.

10 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yeah. That was my thought
11 process. It doesn't seem like there's a lot -- this isn't
12 going to be a high traffic area, you know.

13 MR. MORGAN: Right.

14 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: I mean, you are either going
15 to be doing business back -- You're either going to be in the
16 hotel or you're -- there is not that many other locations for
17 businesses back there. It's not like it's going to be a
18 bustling area with a lot of traffic.

19 MR. WEBER: Well, and along those lines, and not to,
20 not to skip to another topic, but I know one of the require --
21 one of the requests was -- maybe it was a requirement -- was
22 for a traffic impact study. And I don't know if it has to be
23 probably discussed more with the, with the county engineer in
24 his review. But I am looking at this saying, well, right now
25 there is zero, you know.

26 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

27 MR. WEBER: And when we come in there is going to
28 be, you know, ideally, there is, you know, 50, 50, 60 cars a
29 day based on our -- based on, you know, projected occupancies
30 and things like that. So the traffic, the traffic study, you

1 know, I am hoping that Mr. Hadden and his group had just used
2 kind of a generalize term of "traffic impact study" because I
3 can't, I can't see spending, you know, five, six thousand
4 dollars to do traffic analysis all the way down 44 and whatnot
5 just to come up with a count of 60.

6 So I don't know if that's a place for you guys. I
7 wasn't going to, I wasn't actually going to bring that up but
8 we kind of talked about traffic. You know, if that's
9 something that you guys are able to, as a Board, are able to
10 say, okay, yeah, we understand it's been requested but it's
11 not necessary, given the short cul-de-sac and the fact that
12 we've got zero to start and, hopefully, you know, a month
13 after we open, we've got 60, or if that's something I need to
14 just discuss with Mr. Hadden. I don't know if that's a Board
15 issue or --

16 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yeah, we can't -- That's not
17 really up to us.

18 MR. WEBER: Okay. That's fine. I just thought,
19 while I was here and we talked traffic a little bit, I would
20 ask.

21 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right. And that's a
22 really -- it's a pretty hot-button subject. We're really --

23 MR. WEBER: Sure.

24 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: We're very passionate about
25 traffic, so not being able to get into the details is very
26 disappointing.

27 MR. WEBER: Okay. Understood.

28 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Now, with regards to the
29 staff recommendations, the additional stone cladding
30 component, you're okay with that on the --

1 MR. WEBER: Oh, is that -- Are we talking design
2 review as well?

3 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Oh, I'm sorry.

4 MR. WEBER: Yeah. I was kind of holding that.

5 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yeah, I'm jumping the gun,
6 jumping the gun.

7 MR. WEBER: That's all right. I wanted to see you
8 guys --

9 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: No, no, that's right.
10 We're, yeah, we're -- We'll get to that in a minute.

11 MR. WEBER: Okay. All right. No problem.

12 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: So, yes, I am, you know, I
13 like the two, I like the two, the entrance and exits, I think,
14 even more from a safety standpoint, being able to get the -- I
15 am more concerned about, you know, getting a fire truck in or
16 out.

17 MR. PETERSON: Ambulance.

18 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Having two options, being
19 able to get in the two entrances. You know, as much as I
20 understand the, you know, the new regs, the new regs that are
21 coming into place and things like that.

22 MR. WEBER: Right.

23 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: But being that it's a short
24 cul-de-sac, probably not going to be a high traffic area, you
25 know, it's not a main street, I am not as -- I'm not as
26 twisted up about that as, you know --

27 MR. WEBER: Right.

28 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: I am okay with that if you
29 guys are okay with it. I mean, I don't think that's a big
30 issue. I would prefer the two than to just drop it to one. I

1 think it creates a little bit of a cluster problem there and I
2 don't see how that serves the public good, you know, taking
3 the entrance out of there.

4 MR. PETERSON: Agreed.

5 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: So I am okay with that.

6 So now what's the -- so we are going to have to --
7 What do we need to do? We are going to have to get a motion.
8 How are we going, Counselor, how are we going to handle this
9 from a --

10 MS. LANDGRAF: I just wanted to -- There is 2, 3,
11 4 --

12 MR. PETERSON: Yeah. You want to go through those,
13 Andy?

14 MS. LANDGRAF: -- that you might want to go through
15 before.

16 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yeah.

17 MS. LANDGRAF: And then the motion would be made to
18 approve the site plan application subject to the conditions
19 that you agree to.

20 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay.

21 MR. WEBER: As far as Items 2, 3 and 4, we can
22 comply with all of those. Those are just some -- a few
23 cleanup, a few cleanup items.

24 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yeah, revising the plan to
25 designate the "tree save area."

26 MR. WEBER: Correct.

27 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: We talked about the shared
28 driveway. So we're good, we're good, rather than the 50 foot
29 golf course buffer?

30 MR. WEBER: Yeah.

1 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. And then revising,
2 Number 3 would be to revise the plans to indicate the tree
3 save area will be delineated in the field with construction
4 fencing prior to major clearing or construction and will
5 remain in place until the construction is complete.

6 MR. WEBER: Correct.

7 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: You agree with that?

8 MR. WEBER: Correct.

9 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: And then the updated
10 lighting plan to reflect most current site layout plan?

11 MR. WEBER: Yes, correct.

12 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Light poles, all that?

13 MR. PETERSON: I have a question on the lighting.

14 MR. WEBER: Yes.

15 MR. PETERSON: I looked at a satellite view of that
16 piece of property and, at the east end of the parking lot,
17 there is a small buffer zone and then there is a fairway at
18 Quail Hollow, and on the other side of the fairway there are
19 at least three houses that are up right next to the fairway,
20 by my calculation, maybe 400 feet from that parking lot.

21 MR. WEBER: Okay.

22 MR. PETERSON: Would the light be such that there
23 wouldn't be light pollution? In other words, it would be
24 downward cast lighting?

25 MR. WEBER: Correct, yes.

26 MR. PETERSON: So it wouldn't bother those
27 neighbors?

28 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yeah, yeah. The way the
29 lighting is intended, it actually stays within the property
30 lines.

1 MR. PETERSON: Okay.

2 MR. WEBER: I thought you were going to ask if we
3 could light the fairway so you could golf at night. I was
4 going to say, we can't do that, at least, not within the Code,
5 but we can talk later.

6 MR. PETERSON: And if you look at the property, in
7 the summertime, it wouldn't be an issue because there are
8 actually trees by the fairway and there will be a few trees
9 there; but in the wintertime when the leaves are down, it's a
10 straight shot. And it can't be 400 feet to those houses.

11 MR. WEBER: Right.

12 MR. PETERSON: Yeah. I just was concerned they
13 didn't want their house lit up all night all winter.

14 MR. WEBER: Yeah. No, we actually have it set up so
15 that the, so that the lighting is, actually, it's cut off at
16 the property lines, before it hits the property, property
17 lines.

18 MR. PETERSON: Very good.

19 MR. WEBER: There is a minimum standard that we have
20 to meet for the, for the franchise and then, obviously, a
21 maximum that we can't exceed for township regulations. And
22 then, at the same time, we have to be wise with the light
23 pollution.

24 MR. PETERSON: So those people looking out the back
25 of those houses there really wouldn't see much at all?

26 MR. WEBER: No, no.

27 MR. PETERSON: Okay. Thank you.

28 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: So if we drop -- So then
29 what do we do then?

30 MS. LANDGRAF: You make a motion to approve the site

1 plan review application and then just read in the conditions
2 2, 3 and 4.

3 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: So we just don't read --- we
4 exclude condition 1?

5 MS. LANDGRAF: Right.

6 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. Understood,
7 gentlemen?

8 MR. PETERSON: Understood.

9 MR. SCHINDLER: Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: All right. I'll entertain a
11 motion in the affirmative to accept this site plan review
12 application as amended.

13 MR. McINTOSH: Mr. Chairman, I move that we accept
14 for conditional approval the site plan review per staff
15 recommendations Numbers 2, 3 and 4, that's to revise all plans
16 to designate a "tree save area" rather than a 50 foot golf
17 course buffer, as required by Section 38.09.

18 Do I need to read all these?

19 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: No.

20 MR. McINTOSH: I'm sorry. All right.

21 MS. LANDGRAF: Yes, I am sorry, you do.

22 MR. McINTOSH: You do want me --

23 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Oh, we do? Okay.

24 MR. McINTOSH: Yeah, 38.09 --

25 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Read on.

26 MR. McINTOSH: -- of the Zoning Resolution.
27 Number 3, to revise plans to indicate that the "tree save
28 area" will be delineated in the field with construction
29 fencing prior to major clearing or construction, that the
30 fencing shall remain in place until construction is complete.

1 And Number 4, update the lighting plan to reflect the most
2 current site layout plan. Make sure the location and type of
3 light poles proposed are legible on the map.

4 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. I have a motion made.
5 Can I get a second?

6 MR. PETERSON: I will second that motion.

7 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Seconded. All in favor say
8 "aye." Opposed?

9 (Five aye votes, no nay votes.)

10 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: None opposed. Let the
11 record reflect all ayes, none opposed. Okay.

12 MR. WEBER: Thank you, all.

13 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: So that component is done,
14 site plan review.

15 Now we get into the good stuff.

16 MR. MORGAN: Make it pretty.

17 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: What's that?

18 MR. MORGAN: Make it pretty.

19 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yeah. Okay. So Item Number
20 2 on the agenda is the Design Review Application Number 032,
21 Mr. Matthew L. Weber, agent for Unistore -- Unistar
22 Hospitality LLC, is requesting design review approval for a
23 proposed hotel located at 11200 Gold Court and being Permanent
24 Parcel 08-A-020-B-00-004-0.

25 So we have the staff report for this as well and I
26 am assuming everything is acceptable.

27 MR. WEBER: Yeah, yeah. You know, we do have --
28 From the, from the comment, it really indicated that there
29 would be requesting some additional stone maybe to wrap, wrap
30 the door, you know. There is stone around the back side. As

1 I understood it, it's just, more or less, maybe add a little,
2 a little pizzazz and pull this stuff up around or something to
3 make some columns.

4 Again, we just -- it has to be finalized by the, by
5 the franchise but I don't see adding a little bit of stone as
6 being an issue. And as a condition, obviously, to the plan, I
7 don't, I don't think that's going to be an issue. We just
8 have to, we just have to get final approval from them and it's
9 not always a quick phone call.

10 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

11 MR. WEBER: But --

12 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: And it's only the west
13 elevation? Is that -- It's the west elevation, Heather?

14 MS. FREEMAN: That's what we were recommending.

15 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

16 MS. FREEMAN: Just as you're driving down Gold Court
17 and approaching the building, that's the end of the building.

18 MR. WEBER: Actually, yeah, I believe this is the --

19 MS. FREEMAN: They might have been mislabeled.

20 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

21 MR. WEBER: Well, these are labeled right and left.

22 MS. FREEMAN: Yeah.

23 MR. WEBER: I've got to assume, I've got to assume
24 they are labeling them based on as you're looking at the
25 building, so it would be actually the one on the bottom. But,
26 yeah, it doesn't, it doesn't appear to be that would be an
27 issue. I certainly -- I can't imagine they are going to want
28 to take their hotel somewhere else just to have a little bit
29 of stone around the door, so we don't see any issue with that.

30 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Any questions from the

1 Commission?

2 MR. SCHINDLER: None for me.

3 MR. PETERSON: It's a nice looking building.

4 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yeah.

5 MR. MORGAN: Are the signs on the building, are they
6 lighted or are they --

7 MR. WEBER: Are they? Yeah, they are. They are
8 lighted. And that would be an actual full separate package, I
9 believe, the actual full signage.

10 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yeah, signage.

11 MR. WEBER: Yeah. This is for representation and --
12 yeah.

13 MR. MORGAN: I was just wondering about -- just
14 thinking about the layout of that and looking at it, picturing
15 it on the plan layout. Is it really necessary to have the
16 sign on the back side, if that would even be visible. And I
17 am trying to visualize what else is going to be out there
18 adjacent to that.

19 MR. PETERSON: The traffic.

20 MR. MORGAN: I am having trouble putting it in my
21 head. I'd have to go out and look at it but just seeing what
22 would be on the neighboring properties --

23 MR. PETERSON: That's BB Bradley over there. But
24 northbound on Crile or 44, you would see that.

25 MR. WEBER: That's what I was going to ask. If you
26 are coming down, there is a gas station and then you come,
27 kind of, into that, you know.

28 MR. MORGAN: I was just trying to think how far up
29 close to, close to Crile it is going to be.

30 MR. WEBER: So it's just a, it's just a matter of,

1 you know, it's one of those -- I think you will see it. It
2 is just a matter of when, you know, if you get right up on it
3 or --

4 MR. MORGAN: I am not necessarily opposed to it,
5 just trying to think of what's there and what -- if it's even,
6 if you're going to have something lighted, it's going to be
7 bouncing off another building rather than being visible.

8 MR. WEBER: Right.

9 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Any other discussion on
10 this? Any questions, concerns?

11 MR. SCHINDLER: None for me.

12 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: So we only have one staff
13 recommendation, correct? Am I missing something or we have
14 the one staff recommendation for the --

15 MS. FREEMAN: There was one condition that I was
16 recommending.

17 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right, yeah, one condition.

18 MS. FREEMAN: Yeah, everything else looked good.

19 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: All right. At this point,
20 if there are no other questions or comments, I guess I will
21 entertain a motion in the affirmative to accept the design
22 review application as proposed with the one notation of the
23 one recommendation, condition.

24 MR. McINTOSH: Mr. Chairman, I move that we accept
25 -- conditionally approve the site plan -- the design review
26 application with the conditional of staff recommendation
27 Number 1 for the additional stone cladding to be added to west
28 left wall elevation to frame the doorway to give a better
29 impression of the building as visitors approach it from Gold
30 Court.

1 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. We have a motion
2 made. Can I get a second?

3 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I will second that.

4 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: We have a motion made and
5 seconded. All in favor say "aye." Opposed?

6 (Five aye votes, no nay votes.)

7 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: None opposed, let the record
8 reflect. You're all set.

9 MR. WEBER: All right. Thank you all very much.

10 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Thank you. Good
11 presentation.

12 MR. WEBER: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Good luck with the project.

14 MR. WEBER: Thank you very much.

15 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. Item Number 3 on the
16 agenda this evening is to accept a Zoning Application
17 Amendment -- I was just looking at it. Where did it go?
18 There it is -- Zoning Application Amendment Number 0218-2 by
19 Richard Sommers, of Sommers Real Estate Group, to amend the
20 Zoning Resolution text, Section 22, and schedule a public
21 hearing. This is the other thing we were talking about.
22 Happened rather fast.

23 MS. FREEMAN: Yeah.

24 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: This is the parcel directly
25 opposite in the proposed Town Neighborhood that we opted not
26 to approve last, last time around, right across the street.
27 We kind of knew this was coming.

28 MS. FREEMAN: Yeah. Excuse me, Mr. Chairman.
29 Right. What this application is, it's a proposed text
30 amendment that would affect all the property zoned Town Hall

1 Neighborhood. And in the applicant's submittal and
2 application, in addition to the proposed text that he would
3 like to be, like, modified, they included a concept plan that,
4 as far as I understand, complies with the proposed text
5 amendment, just for your, just for your -- as an exhibit as
6 part of his application.

7 So the purpose tonight is just to schedule this for
8 his public hearing with the Zoning Commission and then the
9 process will start. And if we did it at our next regularly
10 scheduled meeting, that would be in compliance with the ORC as
11 far as timelines.

12 MR. PETERSON: Heather, what kind of housing is
13 this? Is it cluster homes? Condos?

14 MS. FREEMAN: Based on the text that was provided,
15 it looks like single-family dwellings.

16 MR. PETERSON: But it doesn't say whether they're
17 condominium, freestanding condominiums or --

18 MS. FREEMAN: The way the text is written, it's fee
19 simple lots, so you'd do it -- own the lot.

20 MR. PETERSON: Individual houses.

21 MS. FREEMAN: Own the lots, fee simple.

22 MR. PETERSON: Very small houses.

23 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Small lots.

24 MR. PETERSON: Yeah. And the houses, the square
25 footage of the houses is quite small. That's why I thought
26 maybe it was a condo or a cluster home.

27 MS. FREEMAN: Well, we can talk about this more at
28 the hearing but those are the actual -- those minimums are
29 what we have in other districts in the township.

30 MR. PETERSON: Okay.

1 MS. FREEMAN: For residential.

2 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Now, is that, is that
3 Craig's property that this is going to? The Concord Nursery,
4 is that going to abut up against that?

5 MS. FREEMAN: I think, yeah, I mean, in our next
6 agenda item on the work session, we're going to go into a
7 little more in the Town Hall Neighborhood and Commons
8 Districts, so we can -- but, yeah, that is Maple Ridge Garden
9 that's directly next door.

10 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. That's what I
11 thought. A lot of lots, cramming them in there. Any
12 comments?

13 MR. SCHINDLER: It's about the same, I think,
14 density as we've had with Quail Hollow being built up and all
15 the condos and stuff that had been going in all along that
16 road over the years, the way I see it.

17 MR. McINTOSH: I don't, yeah, I don't see a problem.
18 I mean, I think, again, conversation for the public hearing or
19 discussion with a thorough presentation. My first thought is,
20 considering we had no citizen input on the last request and
21 that this has some kind of a proposal attached to it, I am
22 wondering if we won't get some feedback from the community on
23 this one. It would definitely be welcomed.

24 MR. SCHINDLER: I think the only thing we will
25 probably get feedback from is increased traffic.

26 MR. McINTOSH: Yeah.

27 MR. SCHINDLER: That always seems to be the issue,
28 how it affects the people, you know, coming in, like I say, to
29 Quail Hollow area, I think, getting out, it wouldn't affect
30 them because it's not --

1 MR. McINTOSH: It's away from them.

2 MR. SCHINDLER: It's away from them, you know. So

3 --

4 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. All right. Any other
5 comments? So we will be able to get this on the agenda,
6 Heather, with the way we're at, where we're at?

7 MS. FREEMAN: Right. At the next scheduled -- or
8 the April 3rd meeting, if you choose to recommend that you
9 schedule it.

10 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: All right. I'll accept a
11 motion in the affirmative for the zoning amendment
12 application, Richard Sommers.

13 MS. FREEMAN: To schedule a public hearing.

14 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: To schedule a public
15 hearing.

16 MR. McINTOSH: Mr. Chairman, I move that we schedule
17 a public hearing to accept -- for Zoning Amendment Application
18 Number 2018-2 by Mr. Richard Sommers, of Sommers Real Estate
19 Group, to amend Zoning Resolution text in Section 22 and
20 schedule a public hearing.

21 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. Motion made.

22 MR. PETERSON: I will second.

23 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Seconded. All in favor say
24 "aye." Opposed?

25 (Five aye votes, no nay votes.)

26 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: None opposed, let the record
27 reflect. All right. So we get that on the agenda and that
28 will be set for a public hearing at our next regularly
29 scheduled zoning meeting. What's that date? That is what?

30 MR. PETERSON: April 3rd.

1 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: April 3rd, April 3rd, public
2 hearing, should be interesting.

3 Okay. Now, on the back end of this, Item Number 4
4 on the agenda, work session, Town Hall Neighborhood and Town
5 Hall Commons District. Heather, do you want to come up and
6 tell us where we're at with that?

7 MS. FREEMAN: Sure. Okay. So in your packets, you
8 will have a few maps. The one on top is probably just a
9 zoomed in section of the Zoning Map kind of highlighting the
10 zoning districts in the Town Hall Neighborhood and Town Hall
11 Commons District, which is basically at the crossroads of
12 Concord-Hambden and Ravenna. So the parcels shaded in the
13 brown diagonal lines are the Town Hall Neighborhood, the dark
14 brown is the Town Hall Commons.

15 And I will just kind of talk briefly about, like,
16 what's in this area and kind of what's around it. On the
17 subsequent maps, you will see just an aerial photo with the
18 property lines of the -- of all the land zoned either Town
19 Hall Neighborhood, which is over here, or the Town Hall
20 Commons. And these are new aerial photos that were just flown
21 in December of 2017, so this is pretty close to what's out
22 there today.

23 So there are currently 28 acres zoned Town Hall
24 Neighborhood. This district is located west of Ravenna and
25 fronts upon both north and south sides of Concord-Hambden.
26 The majority of the land is vacant, with the exception of one
27 active gas well and two nonconforming, unoccupied single-
28 family dwellings, along with some accessory buildings.

29 There are approximately 19.4 acres on the north side
30 of Concord-Hambden that's zoned the Town Hall Neighborhood and

1 this area is bound by I-90 to the north, and there is some
2 existing residential single-family homes also to the north --
3 well, one, actually, and to the east some additional single-
4 family homes and a church. To the west there is a parcel of
5 vacant land in addition to the corporate headquarters for
6 Grimes Horticulture, which is a manufacturing company. It's
7 just the corporate headquarters but it is zoned manufacturing.
8 The land to the south, which is on the south side of Concord-
9 Hambden, is basically vacant land, along with one -- along
10 with some residential, both multi-family which is off of
11 Hunting -- or Hunters Trail there and then also the single-
12 family dwelling that's unoccupied.

13 So then just kind of describe the 8.6 acres of land
14 on the south side of Concord-Hambden that's also zoned Town
15 Hall Neighborhood, one existing unoccupied single-family
16 dwelling with vacant land, a little bit of an encroach from
17 the garden onto that land. To the, to the east of this is, is
18 Maple Ridge Garden Center which is, it's actually a
19 nonconforming use in the Town Hall Commons District, meaning
20 that, if that use came in today, it would not be permitted
21 there. There is multi-family to the west of this area and
22 single-family to the south, which is a phase of the Quail
23 community. And then, obviously, the land on the north side of
24 Concord-Hambden is vacant.

25 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Do you know what the lot
26 size is on Hunting Lake?

27 MS. FREEMAN: Those lots are around -- The overall
28 density in Quail Hollow is three units per acre but I believe
29 these lot sizes are close to 20,000 square feet. No, no,
30 they're close to like a quarter acre.

1 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: So like a builder's third
2 or --

3 MS. FREEMAN: What's that?

4 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: A builder's third or is it
5 less than a third, more than a quarter?

6 MS. FREEMAN: Oh, less than a third. It's more like
7 a quarter acre.

8 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: A quarter acre?

9 MS. FREEMAN: Yeah, like .2 or, you know, .18. I
10 think I have that information in front of me. It's something
11 we can -- I can get for you though, what the lot sizes are.

12 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: I am just looking at it from
13 a consistency standpoint of what's already there and trying
14 to, trying to maintain some level of consistency with what --
15 if we're going to change that and allow residential, to keep
16 it at least with within the guidelines. And I don't want to
17 pile a bunch on, you know, get crazy with the density issue
18 there, keep it at least, you know, take into consideration the
19 people that are already there and their properties and not,
20 you know --

21 MR. McINTOSH: It looks like this -- It looks like
22 the lots that run through Quail that are on Hunting Lake,
23 you've got some kind of, on the end, that are larger and then
24 some that have that little -- what is it -- cul-de-sac, that
25 little nub there have bigger lots, but there is a row of them
26 there that are packed in fairly tight.

27 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

28 MR. McINTOSH: So it would nice to see what the
29 range is, the biggest to the smallest, and kind of what the
30 average works out there.

1 MS. FREEMAN: In this phase of Quail?

2 MR. McINTOSH: Yeah, in this --

3 MR. MORGAN: Yeah. What was provided with the
4 application, they look like they're about a quarter acre.
5 These ones are two-hundredths of an acre -- two-tenths of an
6 acre, so these ones are probably around a quarter, a quarter
7 to a third.

8 MR. McINTOSH: Yeah, close.

9 MS. FREEMAN: Right. And then directly --

10 MR. MORGAN: If you follow --

11 MS. FREEMAN: You know, directly to the west of that
12 is an actual -- it looks like it's part of Quail but it's
13 actually not part of Quail. It's an R-3 multi-family
14 development. That's off of Pelican and people on Pine and
15 Gabriel's Landing. So that density is probably more like up
16 to eight units per acre. So that's to the west.

17 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yeah, we don't want to go in
18 that direction or, at least, I don't. I am not speaking for
19 the entire Board.

20 MR. PETERSON: Those are, those are attached condos.

21 MS. FREEMAN: Right, which was permitted under the
22 R-3 District.

23 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yeah. That's part of --
24 That's all part of the Quail development.

25 MS. FREEMAN: It's not though.

26 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: No. I mean, it's part of
27 the PUD, right?

28 MS. FREEMAN: No, no. I don't know the time frame
29 of when that went in but it's not part of the PUD. So
30 everything in the Quail Hollow that's PUD is actually zoned

1 the R-2 PUD. This is an R-3 development. I don't know what
2 came first. I don't know the history of that, if that's --
3 but it looks like it's part of the Quail development the way
4 it's kind of assimilated itself to the, to the neighborhood.

5 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

6 MS. FREEMAN: Okay. So then we have kind of talked
7 about what the land uses are in the Town Hall Neighborhood,
8 basically, vacant, nonconforming single-family dwellings. But
9 we also want to take a look at, you know, the Town Hall
10 Commons District, which is just to the east of that. And
11 really the Town Hall Commons District encompasses about 36
12 acres. The property on the northwest corner of Concord-
13 Hambden and Ravenna, that's being used for institutional
14 purposes, the church that's located there. The land on the
15 northeast corner contains two occupied nonconforming
16 dwellings, while the remaining land is basically being used
17 for public purposes, including the Old Stone School museum,
18 the community garden, soccer fields and other publicly-owned
19 vacant land on this northeast quadrant.

20 Then if you're looking at the south, southwest side
21 of Ravenna and Concord-Hambden, I would say about half this
22 land is vacant while the other half is developed, two
23 nonconforming single-family occupied homes and then the one
24 nonconforming landscaping business with some vacant land in
25 between.

26 Then if you are looking on the east side of Ravenna,
27 that parcel, the largest parcel on that side is zoned Town
28 Hall Neighborhood -- or Commons is owned by the Township, and
29 there are two smaller parcels that have single-family homes on
30 there that are nonconforming uses that kind of sit next to the

1 fire station and front of Concord-Hambden.

2 So that's a quick overview of what land is in there,
3 what the current uses are, what's kind of the surrounding
4 uses. I didn't really talk about -- I guess, to the east of
5 the Town Hall Commons District, we have the Greenway Corridor
6 that runs north and south which kind of creates a buffer
7 between the neighborhoods to the east and then also the
8 Environmental Learning Center, which is part of the
9 Metroparks, and the cemetery is on that side.

10 I have included just a quick existing zoning, what
11 the purpose statements are in the current Zoning Resolution
12 for both the Town Hall Commons and the Neighborhood District.
13 So the purpose of Town Hall Commons District when this was
14 originally adopted was, was to preserve and enhance the
15 historic center of the township at the Concord-Hambden/Ravenna
16 Road crossroads area through a mixture of community
17 facilities, business and recreational uses that serve as a
18 gathering place for the community.

19 I think this district, the Town Hall Commons
20 District is doing that fairly well. I mean, this is where the
21 Town Hall is. This is where we have the recreation fields,
22 cemetery, the museum and access to the Greenway Corridor.

23 And then the Town Hall Neighborhood District purpose
24 was to compliment the historic center of the township at
25 Concord-Hambden/Ravenna Road crossroads with selective
26 community-oriented business and residential uses while
27 promoting emerging land use patterns. So the Town Hall
28 Neighborhood District, as you know, we haven't had anything.
29 Nothing has been developed new in that area since we put this
30 zoning district in place. Some of the uses that are permitted

1 in there include the medical and dental offices,
2 administrative offices, restaurants, personal services, bed
3 and breakfast, business services, child day care, the
4 residential care facilities, nursing homes, home for the
5 aging, hospice care facilities, and then the one we really
6 can't regulate which is surface extraction of sand, gravel and
7 other earth materials.

8 I tried to take a look at how we addressed these
9 areas in our current adopted Comprehensive Plans. So in the
10 2004 Comprehensive Plan, which is still partially in effect
11 other than what's been superceded in the 2015 update, did talk
12 about recommending creation of a town center at this
13 intersection at Concord-Hambden and Ravenna and that was the
14 basis for the Township creating both the THN and THC zoning
15 districts.

16 Originally, when this Board, when the Zoning
17 Commission worked with the Zoning staff at that time on
18 developing the uses in the Town Hall Neighborhood District,
19 they had an additional opportunity in there for the
20 possibility of single-family detached cluster homes as a
21 conditional use in the Town Hall Neighborhood District.
22 However, as it went through the public hearing process, that
23 ultimately never did get adopted and what we have today is
24 what was adopted.

25 Since the 2004 plan update, the Township embarked on
26 the 2006 Auburn-Crile Corridor Study which further explored
27 the idea of this town center; however, the location of that
28 shifted from this area to land west of State Route 44 at the
29 intersection of Capital and Auburn Road.

30 Furthermore, in the 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update,

1 there were strategies in there that were recommended to help
2 implement the future town center at the new location.

3 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

4 MS. FREEMAN: In addition to that, this Board also
5 adopted the Capital District zoning text which was to help
6 facilitate the creation of that mixed use town center over at
7 Capital and Auburn and west to State Route 44 and Capital.

8 So taking a look at what else did the Comprehensive
9 Plan update state in 2015, it didn't really make any direct
10 recommendations or really take a look at this area where the
11 Town Hall Neighborhood and Town Hall Commons District is. I
12 think that we need to look at it a little bit more, which is
13 kind of what we're starting now. The '15 plan update did make
14 some recommendations to some of the properties within this
15 area but not to the districts as a whole.

16 And I did pull out a section of that and provided
17 that to you where we talked about the best use of the township
18 properties. So a lot of the properties that the Township owns
19 are in the Town Hall Commons area. And the idea was that, in
20 the future, if we need to expand recreational uses over here,
21 depending on the community's needs, we own the land already
22 over here.

23 In the, in the Comprehensive Plan Update, there was,
24 in additional to that, there was a concept plan that was
25 created by a landscape architect, just some idea of what could
26 happen, you know, down the line in this area. There's always
27 been the discussion of purchasing some of these private
28 parcels that are in the Commons District when they become
29 available. They're indicated on the concept plan, that's
30 somewhat of a long-range goal of the community to acquire

1 those. And those specifically are the nonconforming uses that
2 are currently standing in that area, the dwellings at the
3 corner of Ravenna and Concord-Hambden and then next to the
4 fire station on Concord-Hambden.

5 There really was not much discussion about the Town
6 Hall Neighborhood District and what the future of that might
7 be but we do know that the primary focus of where all the
8 commercial development which is happening in Concord is really
9 over on the main corridor. People want to be on Crile. They
10 want to have that visibility. We have seen that with the
11 recent addition of Crile Crossing Retail Center and the
12 Discount Drug Mart site, now the hotel that is looking to
13 locate there and all the other, other retail uses that I am
14 constantly getting inquiries about.

15 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: I see they're starting --

16 MS. FREEMAN: There doesn't seem to be much interest
17 here.

18 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: They're starting
19 construction on Chipotle now, too.

20 MR. PETERSON: I saw that.

21 MS. FREEMAN: Yeah, yeah, construction is starting
22 on Chipotle.

23 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: That's starting now. Yeah,
24 I don't, you know -- My concern with this area, you know, we
25 had hoped, I think, when we, when we kind of originally put
26 this idea together, I think that we had hoped that it would
27 get developed in that direction. But I think, for me, and I
28 think one of the reasons it hasn't in the way that we -- even
29 though I thought we were pretty generous with the options that
30 could go in there and the things that could, that could

1 develop in that area, I think, when you look at that section
2 in the township, it is kind of isolated. You know, there is
3 nothing really, there is nothing -- there is no way to --
4 Anything that's going to be here is, pretty much, going to be
5 to, almost, to the exclusive use of the people that live in
6 the immediate area.

7 MR. SCHINDLER: Yeah.

8 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: You know? And that's what,
9 that's what I think what's been -- I think that's kind of
10 what's been a little bit of a sticking point. Other than
11 housing, okay --

12 MR. McINTOSH: Well, yeah.

13 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: -- to go in there, I mean,
14 it's really been anything, anything that would be commercial
15 or personal services or office building, I mean, there's
16 nothing, I mean, there is no easy -- The easiest way to get to
17 the freeway is driving all the way down Concord-Hamben Road to
18 44.

19 MR. McINTOSH: In addition, for any of that to
20 happen, you are now having to get -- you are having, you're
21 having to take something that's, right now, you've got vacant
22 land.

23 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

24 MR. McINTOSH: A chunk of it, residential, and then
25 a little bit of, I mean, you've got the landscaping
26 businesses, there's two of them, and then you've got just --
27 You are looking for those things to turn over and have the
28 ground then become available so someone would go in and build
29 a structure where you would then create an office.

30 What you are seeing -- and we're very big on this,

1 you know, we talk about zoning -- is the fact that, where is
2 the interest? We've now had two interests in the vacant land
3 portions of it and that interest, that interest lies in
4 residential. So just extrapolating, if we were to sit there
5 and say, "Hey, that -- it fits. Let's, you know, go ahead
6 with that," you are just pushing that trend further in the
7 direction. You have a chance, potentially, to continue the
8 residential trend, along with the property that you've got the
9 Township owning and the, you know, abutting up to a park and
10 then some residential there. I mean, you've got a pretty
11 strong trend on what's popular in that area.

12 Then when you take a look at what we've been saying
13 is what we did with that and then now the work we've done over
14 in the corridor, Crile Crossing, the stuff on 44, all the way
15 over to Capital Parkway and Auburn, the things we have
16 conceptually discussed over there and the adult -- we have the
17 nursing homes that are over there that was talked about
18 something that might be for this area. They are opting to be
19 closer to the hospital, into that Health District or, at
20 least, abut, you know, next to it.

21 So I think we have a lot of strong indicators that
22 these purpose statements are out of line with what is
23 happening. You know, we're seeing interest that is totally
24 divergent of this.

25 MR. PETERSON: And to add to that, if you recall,
26 this larger section, the two Osborne properties, there was
27 interest in apartments.

28 MR. McINTOSH: Residential.

29 MR. PETERSON: Which would have been residential.
30 You know, it didn't happen but it was interest in that

1 purpose.

2 MR. McINTOSH: It's a fairly, I think, it's a fairly
3 clear indicator what the, what the interest is for that.

4 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Well, I think, you know,
5 I think, the idea when this was done, I think, was genuine.

6 MR. McINTOSH: Yeah.

7 MR. PETERSON: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: You know, I think the
9 concept was there. And now -- But there was nothing
10 happening. Well, now things are happening. Development is
11 starting to occur and the development and what we're seeing is
12 the demand and the market is pushing it that way, not this
13 way.

14 MS. FREEMAN: Correct.

15 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: So what's the point in
16 holding out for something to come this way? At this point,
17 every proposal that's come across our desk here as, as a
18 Zoning Commission --

19 MR. McINTOSH: It's residential.

20 MR. PETERSON: Residential.

21 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: -- has been residential.
22 Okay? I mean, we haven't had -- I haven't seen one proposal
23 to come in here for any of this property to be --

24 MR. McINTOSH: Commercial.

25 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: -- any kind of commercial
26 use, whether it's personal services, whether it's office,
27 doctors' offices, business, whatever. I haven't seen
28 anything.

29 MR. PETERSON: Right.

30 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Everything that's been,

1 that's been brought before us has been rezone it and do it as
2 residential. So it's like how much, you know -- And at that
3 point, I think the reason why we held that at bay was because
4 nothing had really been happening yet. Well, now things are
5 happening and so we see where the emphasis is. So, you know,
6 I guess I'm, I'm more prone to rezoning that area and changing
7 it.

8 MR. McINTOSH: Well, I think when you think about,
9 too, as we said earlier -- and I forget what point but we
10 mentioned traffic, traffic being an issue. We had a
11 residential proposal for the two Osborne properties to turn it
12 into -- And if I recall, the bigger part of our issue wasn't
13 so much -- it was the density nature of that residential that
14 we didn't like.

15 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

16 MR. McINTOSH: It was the high density. We were
17 skeptical that it was the type of product that Concord
18 demanded. And the other concern was the amount of traffic on
19 Concord-Hambden ultimately abutting Auburn there and that
20 being a problematic intersection.

21 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

22 MR. McINTOSH: So to Andy's point about access and
23 business and traffic, it seems like it's in our interest to
24 really consider how, you know -- maybe we look at, really
25 evaluate. You've got a couple of proposals, potentially, here
26 for some residential that would be far less density than that
27 apartment complex we were looking at but yet it's fitting
28 what's around there. It's seeming to indicate a trend. Maybe
29 we take a look at it from that standpoint and say, hey, that
30 fits better.

1 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: What's the -- yeah.

2 MR. McINTOSH: Yeah, keeps the density down and then
3 keeps the traffic on that road a little more reasonable than,
4 you know, quadrupling it with the high density.

5 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: What's the sewer? What's
6 the sewer access there?

7 MS. FREEMAN: Sewer is available.

8 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: For all, for all of this on
9 the --

10 MR. PETERSON: Except, if you recall, the apartments
11 had a problem with the topography.

12 MS. FREEMAN: Well, hold on.

13 MR. PETERSON: But the gentleman last month said you
14 could connect to sewers on the north end by I-90.

15 MS. FREEMAN: So, right, so sewer is available at
16 Concord-Hambden and Ravenna and west. Are we just talking
17 about the Neighborhood property right now?

18 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yes, just the Neighborhood.

19 MS. FREEMAN: Yeah. So there is sewer available in
20 front of all the Town Hall Neighborhood property. There is
21 some gravity issue problems with the property on the north
22 that, depending on where the homes or the business would be
23 located, they would be required to do some kind of --

24 MR. SCHINDLER: It would be a pumping station.

25 MS. FREEMAN: -- a pumping station, gravity lift.

26 MR. SCHINDLER: Yeah.

27 MS. FREEMAN: But those are things that, you know,
28 obviously, would be worked out with the county.

29 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: I'm not, personally, I mean,
30 in looking what we've done, I am not inclined to mess with the

1 other side, with all, with all the Concord Township owned
2 property. I am not inclined to do anything --

3 MS. FREEMAN: Town Hall Commons?

4 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yeah. I'm not, I'm not
5 inclined to mess with that.

6 MR. PETERSON: Especially if you look at this
7 concept, I think that's excellent.

8 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right. I am not inclined --
9 I am more inclined to leave that alone.

10 MR. PETERSON: Yeah, I agree.

11 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Leave it as it is, leave it
12 as it is designated.

13 MR. MORGAN: As you are looking at it right now,
14 there is two parcels that are vacant.

15 MR. McINTOSH: It's like three, yeah.

16 MR. MORGAN: The rest of them are some nonconforming
17 uses that were there before.

18 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

19 MR. MORGAN: So you're not dealing with what you're
20 dealing with here.

21 MR. McINTOSH: Correct.

22 MR. MORGAN: Which is four or five vacant lots.

23 MR. McINTOSH: Yep, correct.

24 MR. SCHINDLER: If you think about it, if this was
25 rezoned for residential purposes, this side would still be
26 utilized by the residents who live there.

27 MR. PETERSON: They would love that.

28 MR. SCHINDLER: They would love this.

29 MR. PETERSON: That would be a real attraction.

30 MR. SCHINDLER: Because now we already have, for

1 example, a baseball field. There has been talk in the past
2 about maybe putting in a swimming pool and stuff for the, for
3 the township. That would all be utilized by the people living
4 here and we still have the access to the historical area that
5 they can --

6 MR. PETERSON: And the Gateway Trail.

7 MR. SCHINDLER: And Gateway Trail.

8 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yeah. Like I said, I am not
9 inclined, I'm not inclined to really do anything with the --

10 MR. SCHINDLER: Right.

11 MR. MORGAN: I agree.

12 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: -- with the portion east of
13 Ravenna.

14 MR. SCHINDLER: No.

15 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: You know, I'm more inclined
16 to consider --

17 MR. SCHINDLER: Right.

18 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: So then the question is,
19 what's the right -- Is it R-1? Do you do R-1 because it's got
20 sewer access and certainly would fit into the R-1 designation?
21 You know, I don't want to get, I just don't want to get too --
22 I don't want to cram too much in there.

23 MR. SCHINDLER: Well, R-1 requires half acre
24 property, right, half acre lots, R-1?

25 MS. FREEMAN: The R-1 with sewer access is 22,000
26 square feet.

27 MR. SCHINDLER: Twenty-two thousand square feet.

28 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: So it's half acre.

29 MR. SCHINDLER: That's half acre.

30 MR. PETERSON: Yeah.

1 MR. SCHINDLER: That, I think, as far as density,
2 would probably be the best suited for that area, you know.

3 MR. PETERSON: Agreed.

4 MR. SCHINDLER: You know, you still won't be jamming
5 people in there but yet it would be comfortable.

6 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: What was, what was, what was
7 your -- Was it Yurko?

8 MS. FREEMAN: Yurak.

9 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yurak, sorry. No offense,
10 Mr. Yurak. His proposal was, what, three lots there?

11 MR. PETERSON: Yeah, three.

12 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: They were, what, about half
13 acre?

14 MR. PETERSON: A little over.

15 MR. SCHINDLER: A little over.

16 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: A little over half?

17 MR. SCHINDLER: Yeah.

18 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yeah. Now, see, I think,
19 you know, I think that -- And I think if you made it R-1'ish
20 and then tried to stay true to that, to that design, I think
21 you'd probably have a lot less pushback from the residents
22 that are on Hunting Lake and in that area, you know, if you
23 kept it at a more reasonable, you know -- As far as the
24 proposal that's here with that other, you know, they're like
25 really -- He's just got them crammed in there.

26 MR. PETERSON: Well, there is only one entrance into
27 that, too.

28 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

29 MR. PETERSON: From a safety standpoint, I don't
30 think that would fly.

1 MR. SCHINDLER: Yeah, the fire department --

2 MR. PETERSON: Has to have two, right.

3 MR. SCHINDLER: -- prefers to have two accesses.

4 MS. FREEMAN: Well, let's just be careful about
5 what, you know, not talking about that proposal.

6 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right, right.

7 MR. SCHINDLER: Oh, I know, I know.

8 MS. FREEMAN: But, you know --

9 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: I didn't say anything
10 negative. I just -- I inferred.

11 MS. FREEMAN: Yeah. So what I am hearing is it
12 sounds like you are open to maybe allowing some other, you
13 know, single-family residential use.

14 MR. McINTOSH: What might -- I mean, I kind of go
15 back to some -- It might be worthwhile to, and it would great
16 to get some feedback at a public hearing when you have a
17 conceptual idea being presented to you. Having seen somebody
18 else's proposal, to be able to get a little bit more of an
19 idea and sort of dialogue about what might be possible, you
20 know, cross that bridge, so to speak, and not to take anything
21 by gospel, just know that we're going to have an additional
22 conversation, additional process and presentation by somebody
23 to, to kick around some ideas and it certainly brings merit to
24 the table. That conversation might help us craft even more
25 clarity on what to do with this.

26 MR. MORGAN: If you are talking about R-1, at least,
27 on the north side of Concord-Hambden, you are looking at, you
28 know, maximum 40 lots if they crammed them in some way,
29 probably more looking, you know, when you consider roadways
30 and everything else through there, it may be 35.

1 MR. McINTOSH: Right.

2 MR. MORGAN: Thirty-two lots.

3 MR. SCHINDLER: And you still want to minimize the
4 amount of traffic.

5 MR. MORGAN: That's a --

6 MR. McINTOSH: You would, yeah.

7 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yeah. I think, at that
8 point, you're -- what we're doing is, you know, we're
9 recognizing the need to keep, you know, keep the density under
10 control.

11 MR. McINTOSH: Right.

12 MR. SCHINDLER: Right.

13 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: You know, and not just have
14 like a free-for-all, you know.

15 MR. SCHINDLER: Yeah.

16 MS. FREEMAN: So the density in R-1 is basically two
17 units per acre when you do the math, you know.

18 MR. McINTOSH: Correct.

19 MS. FREEMAN: Two units per acre. I did want to
20 point out, in addition, you know, I had just a couple other
21 points here. In the Comp Plan Update, if you recall, there
22 were some different recommendations that related to -- Well,
23 we kind of talked about this in previous work sessions when we
24 were looking at consolidating all the residential districts
25 and we eliminated the R-5 District and talked about whether or
26 not we could zone for, you know, senior housing, which we got
27 the opinion from our legal counsel that, no, it wouldn't be
28 appropriate for a township to say, you know, we're going to
29 allow senior housing here or here and, you know, it will look
30 like this or that.

1 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

2 MS. FREEMAN: But there was still a lot of
3 discussion in the Comp Plan Update on whether or not we, you
4 know, within the zoning we could allow for lower maintenance
5 properties, single-family dwellings, whether it be through the
6 R-3 District or some other modification, to allow basically a
7 pocket neighborhood. And then this comes right out of the
8 Comp Plan. They said to consider a small scale development
9 such as a pocket neighborhood with a limited amount of acreage
10 and a number of units as an alternative to providing for
11 senior housing that would be compatible with existing
12 neighborhoods in the district.

13 And that kind of, you know, that part of the
14 Comprehensive Plan kind of struck with me when it came to this
15 because this is a limit -- the Town Hall Neighborhood District
16 is limited. It's, you know, 38 acres or 28 acres -- I am
17 sorry -- 28 acres. If this were to be developed residential,
18 I think it would be compatible with the neighborhoods. From
19 what I am hearing from other developers, a half acre is still
20 sometimes too large for those aging that want to really want
21 to have no --

22 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

23 MS. FREEMAN: -- you know, maintenance of their
24 property. They really want to downsize.

25 MR. SCHINDLER: Well, we were also hoping that we
26 wanted to have the residents that were older still living in
27 the township to stay within the township.

28 MS. FREEMAN: Yes, right, yes.

29 MR. SCHINDLER: People like myself, for example.

30 MS. FREEMAN: Yeah.

1 MR. SCHINDLER: To have some other lots --

2 MS. FREEMAN: There's a lot of people looking for
3 ranches --

4 MR. SCHINDLER: Yeah, right.

5 MS. FREEMAN: -- and lower maintenance property.

6 MR. SCHINDLER: Exactly. So we can encourage them
7 to stay and still maintain something that would be desirable
8 for them and that can be done, too.

9 MS. FREEMAN: I just, when we talk R-1, I don't know
10 that that's realistic in the market. I don't think R-3 is,
11 that type of density, you know, six units per acre or eight
12 units per acre. But I don't know that, you know --

13 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: So you are thinking like a
14 hybrid?

15 MS. FREEMAN: I don't really know but, I mean, I
16 think the idea of residential -- I think, first of all, it
17 would be whether or not you guys think that residential would
18 be a compatible use in this area. And then this is --

19 MR. SCHINDLER: So you are thinking about creating
20 another zoning district that we would be able to do that?

21 MS. FREEMAN: Or do we --

22 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Or do we just put --

23 MS. FREEMAN: I don't know. Do we somehow modify
24 this and --

25 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Modify, modify the R-1?

26 MS. FREEMAN: Right, yeah, maybe, maybe you --

27 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right, conditionally.

28 MS. FREEMAN: Maybe you allow residential in this
29 existing district under -- this is, kind of -- I don't know
30 how to talk about this when we have this other pending

1 application, so I am just thinking.

2 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

3 MR. PETERSON: Yeah.

4 MR. McINTOSH: Well, we're not, I think, speaking to
5 that point, you are not under any pressure to really -- This
6 is a work session.

7 MS. FREEMAN: Right.

8 MR. McINTOSH: So, possibly, I think we've hashed
9 out a lot. My thought process would be to, kind of, table
10 this discussion.

11 MS. FREEMAN: Yeah.

12 MR. McINTOSH: Kind of see, have the, have the
13 public hearing, kind of see what comes out of that.

14 MS. FREEMAN: Yeah.

15 MR. McINTOSH: You know, I mean, is there any
16 compelling reason to rush into doing something in advance of
17 that public hearing?

18 MS. FREEMAN: No. I mean, unless -- no.

19 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: No, because, I think,
20 because of the fact that it's the entire section --

21 MR. McINTOSH: Yeah.

22 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: -- you know, that's south of
23 Concord-Hambden, it's not, it's not chunking anything up, so
24 to speak.

25 MR. McINTOSH: Correct.

26 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: But the other one was that,
27 just that little piece, you know, that little parcel in the
28 midst of everything.

29 MR. McINTOSH: Right.

30 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: This one is, pretty much,

1 going to lop off that whole chunk of property.

2 MR. McINTOSH: Right.

3 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: And we can, we can take a
4 look at that and I think --

5 MR. McINTOSH: It is probably more appropriate to
6 see that that fits well with what it abuts up to and that's
7 the Quail PUD as opposed to --

8 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

9 MR. PETERSON: But you are not saying the south
10 portion is separate from the north, are you?

11 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: No. What I am saying is
12 that if we look at doing -- You know, we've got this public
13 hearing coming.

14 MR. PETERSON: Okay.

15 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay? But it's encompassing
16 that entire section of that Town Hall.

17 MR. PETERSON: And that would give us an
18 indication --

19 MR. McINTOSH: Whereas, the application we denied
20 was kind of an island. It would have been essentially an
21 island.

22 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Just a little, you know,
23 just a little --

24 MR. McINTOSH: And I think, I think the only thing
25 is, you know, to Andy's point, what you have is you've got
26 Concord-Hambden Road dividing. And I think the only -- I
27 think we were all in somewhat agreement that residential seems
28 like it's the better fit for what's over there now. And the
29 only thing that I see is a differentiator is 608 and one side
30 to the other. It's a matter of density, potentially, I think

1 is what you're talking about.

2 MR. PETERSON: Keep in mind, too, the intersection
3 on the west end has been redesigned since we last looked at
4 this property when the new right turn only and new alternative
5 routes came in.

6 MR. McINTOSH: Oh, up at Auburn.

7 MR. MORGAN: Which is where this Concord-Hambden
8 traffic gravitates to to get to the freeway.

9 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yeah. I mean, pretty much,
10 the vast -- If this turns into residential, the odds are that
11 probably 85 or 90 percent of the traffic from that area is
12 going to be --

13 MR. PETERSON: Going west, yeah.

14 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: -- heading west on Concord-
15 Hambden Road to get to 44 and 90.

16 MR. PETERSON: And the last time we talked about it,
17 we had not redesigned that intersection. Now that
18 intersection is redesigned with two right turn lanes.

19 MR. McINTOSH: Well, the intersection of 44 but not
20 the three-way intersection at 608 and Auburn.

21 MR. PETERSON: Well, yeah.

22 MR. McINTOSH: And I drove through that for 12
23 years.

24 MR. MORGAN: Which is a big intersection.

25 MR. McINTOSH: Yeah, that's a scary intersection.

26 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: That's a dangerous
27 intersection.

28 MR. McINTOSH: Very dangerous.

29 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: I don't like that
30 intersection.

1 MR. PETERSON: That's going to be what it is
2 regardless.

3 MR. MORGAN: I think --

4 MR. McINTOSH: Well, but it's relevant to our
5 conversation about any density we put down that road because,
6 whatever we do, it's going to have an impact. I mean, it's
7 just a matter of how much of an impact it will have.

8 MR. MORGAN: I think I agree. As a Board, I think
9 we are better off waiting until after for any further
10 discussion on this. Let's have the public hearing on the, on
11 the south side issue.

12 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yeah, we don't want to get,
13 we don't want to get ahead of ourselves.

14 MR. MORGAN: And then look at the bigger picture.
15 We put on -- We're putting this on our agenda after the last
16 one. We weren't expecting to have another one sitting in
17 front of us at the same time we were discussing this.

18 MR. McINTOSH: Right. I think we have accomplished
19 a great deal of discussion and I think, you know, Heather,
20 this is an excellent presentation of pulling together the comp
21 plans and different things. And then it was neat to see the
22 -- I think I missed that. The architect's concept was kind of
23 nice. It gives you a vision about some things that are
24 possible and I think we've got a good grasp of it, for sure.

25 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Yeah. You know what I'd
26 like you to do, Heather, is I would like you to take a look at
27 what, what you think, if we do this from a residential
28 standpoint, what would be the appropriate designation and if
29 there is something we can do within the existing zoning
30 designations or if some modifications to existing or would it

1 require creation of another zoning district altogether or do
2 we stick with the existing designation of Town Hall
3 Neighborhood and maybe just modify that to include -- You know
4 what I am saying?

5 MS. FREEMAN: Right.

6 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Do we, do we need to rezone
7 this? Would we need to rezone this to R-1 or would we --

8 MS. FREEMAN: Well, let's, let's -- I kind of think,
9 for next month, obviously, we will have the Planning
10 Commission's recommendation on the proposed text amendment.

11 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

12 MS. FREEMAN: I envision, as staff, I will probably
13 have a feeling one way or the other or maybe have some
14 recommendation, too, based on what was presented.

15 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

16 MS. FREEMAN: And then I think, too, we will know
17 the outcome of the other still pending Zoning Map amendment
18 that is still in front of the Trustees for the two acre piece.
19 That has not been decided on yet. That public hearing was
20 continued till tomorrow evening. So whether or not that gets
21 approved or denied, we should -- I believe we will know that
22 by next month.

23 But I can start looking at what, you know, what I,
24 you know, a recommendation of what I think is appropriate.
25 But I think I kind of agree, maybe we should table it and see
26 what happens with the public hearing next month and then go
27 from there for May.

28 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

29 MS. FREEMAN: If we want to continue to, to look
30 into it.

1 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: I think we are heading in
2 the right direction on this though. And then I would look to
3 you to give us some, some guidance on whether it's rezoning
4 to, you know, to an existing zoning designation or maybe some
5 modification to existing zoning.

6 MS. FREEMAN: Okay.

7 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Which would be the path of
8 least resistance on that for us?

9 MS. FREEMAN: You are asking me which one?

10 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: No, I'm just -- no, no. I
11 am saying --

12 MS. FREEMAN: Yeah.

13 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: You give us what recommend
14 -- You give us your, give us your insight as to what you think
15 would be, you know, the best route to take on that, whether
16 it's developing some additional uses within the Town Hall
17 Neighborhood or whether we scrap Town Hall Neighborhood
18 altogether and redo it as R-1 or some R-something.

19 MS. FREEMAN: Okay.

20 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Or whatever. So I think
21 that would be a good way to go with that. Okay?

22 MS. FREEMAN: Okay.

23 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: So --

24 MR. MORGAN: Just for my knowledge on that, what was
25 the, prior to the Town Hall Neighborhood, what were those
26 parcels zoned?

27 MR. McINTOSH: Business or --

28 MR. PETERSON: Manufacturing on the north.

29 MS. FREEMAN: It was manufacturing on the north.

30 MR. SCHINDLER: Yeah, manufacturing on the north

1 side.

2 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Manufacturing.

3 MS. FREEMAN: What was -- I don't know on the south.
4 Was that also -- I am sorry.

5 MR. MORGAN: It was, it was my assumption that the
6 north side was manufacturing based off of the adjacent parcel.

7 MR. McINTOSH: Yeah.

8 MR. MORGAN: But it was just a curiosity.

9 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: I would have to pull out an
10 old map but I think it was M.

11 MS. FREEMAN: Yeah.

12 MR. SCHINDLER: They were hoping that it would stay
13 that, manufacturing, because they, Quail Hollow people, didn't
14 want to see it change to anything else.

15 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

16 MR. SCHINDLER: And they knew it would never be
17 developed that way.

18 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

19 MR. SCHINDLER: So they felt it would always stay
20 vacant like it is today, right? And when we had the school
21 and everything over here, even though it was mixed, it was
22 going to stay that way. They wanted everything to stay the
23 way it was.

24 MR. MORGAN: Okay. I was just curious.

25 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. All right.

26 Next item on the agenda is the approval of minutes.
27 We had a little snafu the last time, some people were
28 inappropriately labeled.

29 MS. FREEMAN: They have been corrected.

30 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Everything has been

1 corrected. So the first item is the approval of the minutes
2 of the January 23rd meeting.

3 MR. PETERSON: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion that we
4 approve the corrected minutes of the January 23, 2018,
5 meeting.

6 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Motion made.

7 MR. McINTOSH: Second.

8 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Seconded. All in favor say
9 "aye." Opposed? None opposed, let the, let the record.

10 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I will abstain since
11 I was not present.

12 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Abstention from Gerry.
13 Right, you weren't present for January.

14 (Four aye votes, no nay votes, one abstention.)

15 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Okay. Item Number 6 on the
16 agenda is the approval of minutes of the February 6, 2018,
17 meeting.

18 MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I will make a motion to
19 approve the meeting, the meeting minutes of the February 6,
20 2018, meeting.

21 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: We hae a motion made.

22 MR. PETERSON: Second.

23 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Seconded. All in favor say
24 "aye." Opposed?

25 (Five aye votes, no nay votes.)

26 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: None opposed, let the record
27 reflect.

28 Item Number 7, correspondence report by Zoning
29 Commission members. Frank?

30 MR. SCHINDLER: None, Mr. Chairman.

1 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Morgan?

2 MR. McINTOSH: Yes, I actually had two
3 correspondences.

4 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: You did?

5 MR. McINTOSH: Yes, I did.

6 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Wow, that's awesome.

7 MR. McINTOSH: First, I was running across some
8 residents that just had a comment/question/complaint about the
9 reprofiled intersection at Girdled and Hermitage which was
10 done. Yes, the comment that was made is, when you are coming
11 north on Hermitage and then coming onto Girdled, in order to
12 stay outside the center line, that you had to drive sort of
13 right tires off the road, and there was just a question of
14 whose responsibility that was. It just was kind of a
15 complaint about it. So wasn't too happy about it, said it was
16 kind of a crappy --

17 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: You mean where the --

18 MR. PETERSON: It's a 90 degree turn.

19 MR. McINTOSH: Yeah.

20 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right, yeah.

21 MR. McINTOSH: So he said, in order to not cross the
22 center line, he had to put the right tires of his car off the
23 shoulder every time. He drives through it every day and said
24 it's kind of annoying.

25 MR. MORGAN: It is, it is a tough intersection.

26 MR. McINTOSH: I wouldn't disagree with it. I don't
27 know that I think that that really was made better when they
28 did that.

29 MR. PETERSON: I am not quite sure the logic there.

30 MR. McINTOSH: So anyway --

1 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: I went through it the other
2 day. We just kind of went two wheels.

3 MR. McINTOSH: Yeah. It's, it's a little --

4 And then the other correspondence was I was
5 approached by a resident up off of Concord-Hambden on the
6 property that will abut to the property where the Riverside
7 School District has bought to put the school. A resident
8 there was quite upset to hear that the Township was in some
9 kind of -- or had asked if I had heard that they were -- we
10 were in negotiation about settling with the School District
11 and asked a lot of questions and complained about the
12 potential impact to his property value of his house that he
13 hadn't intended to be next to a parking lot that was now going
14 to be lit 24/7 with lights and so forth. So I corresponded
15 and responded with him and gave him some recommendations about
16 talking to the Trustees and voicing his concerns and passed
17 them along as well.

18 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Anything else?

19 MR. McINTOSH: That's it. Busy month for me.

20 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Wow. Gerry?

21 MR. MORGAN: No correspondence, Mr. Chairman.

22 MR. PETERSON: Nothing, Mr. Chairman.

23 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Mr. Peterson, nothing. Wow,
24 quiet, okay. Nothing for me.

25 Audience participation, Number 8 on the agenda, it's
26 an open area for general public comment to the Zoning
27 Commission on items which a public hearing is not scheduled.
28 And there is nobody here except for Connie and Sue, but I
29 shouldn't say no -- I mean as far as outside of the inside.
30 General public.

1 MR. McINTOSH: General public.

2 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: General public.

3 MR. SCHINDLER: Just as long as the meeting always
4 reflects that we don't have --

5 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: Right.

6 MR. SCHINDLER: -- public participating other than
7 members of the either Zoning, Trustees or alternates to the
8 Zoning Commission members who stand in and sit here.

9 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: And if anybody is watching
10 at home, I mean, I hope that they see that we are, in fact,
11 tackling some issues that are important here. There is a lot,
12 there is a lot of serious conversation going on about some
13 things that are happening in the, in the township and it would
14 be nice to get some input. I mean, you know, we welcome
15 people. There is a reason why this item is on the agenda and,
16 you know, it's because we are looking for some residential
17 input instead of having pitchforks and torches at public
18 hearings and other -- and elections.

19 That's not always the time to deal with this stuff.
20 Sometimes these things are in the here and now and it would be
21 nice to get some additional input from some people outside of
22 the five people that sit here at this table once a month, not
23 that I don't value all of your inputs but it sure would be
24 nice to have somebody else chime in every once in a while on
25 what's going on here, at least, show some interest.

26 It seemed like there was a lot of people that said
27 they were, you know, awake and, you know, everything was going
28 to be held to account, and that kind of all dissipated rather
29 quickly. So it would be nice to see some participation.

30 Anyway, Item Number 9 on the agenda is the next

1 Zoning Commission meeting of April 3, 2018. We will have a
2 public hearing on the agenda at that point, correct, have a
3 public hearing?

4 Anything else anybody wants to see put on the
5 agenda, anything else we need to cover?

6 MR. MORGAN: No.

7 MR. SCHINDLER: No, sir.

8 CHAIRMAN LINGENFELTER: This meeting is adjourned.

9 (Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 8:27 p.m.)
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

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

STATE OF OHIO)
COUNTY OF CUYAHOGA)

CERTIFICATE

I, Melinda A. Melton, Registered Professional Reporter, a notary public within and for the State of Ohio, duly commissioned and qualified, do hereby certify that, to the best of my ability, the foregoing proceeding extension reduced by me to stenotype shorthand, subsequently transcribed into typewritten manuscript; and that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of said proceedings so taken as aforesaid.

I do further certify that this proceeding took place at the time and place as specified in the foregoing caption and extension completed without adjournment.

I do further certify that I am not a friend, relative, or counsel for any party or otherwise interested in the outcome of these proceedings.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal of office this 15th day of March 2018.

Melinda A. Melton
Registered Professional Reporter

Notary Public within and for the
State of Ohio

My Commission Expires:
February 4, 2023