

CONCORD TOWNSHIP ZONING COMMISSION
LAKE COUNTY, OHIO
REGULAR MEETING

Concord Town Hall
7229 Ravenna Road
Concord, Ohio 44077

March 3, 2020
7:00 p.m.

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Zoning Commission members present:

Richard Peterson, Chairman
Sue Germovsek, Vice Chair
Frank Schindler, Member
Andrew Lingenfelter, Member

Also Present:

Heather Freeman, Planning & Zoning Director/Zoning
Inspector
Marty Pitkin, Assistant Zoning Inspector

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

1 7:10 p.m.

2 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Good evening. I'd like to call
3 to order the Concord Township Zoning Commission meeting for
4 Tuesday, March 3, 2020.

5 We have a number of items on the agenda tonight.
6 The first two are related to Site Plan Review Application
7 Number 039, Mr. Marino Capra, of Capra Business Center, LLC,
8 is requesting a site plan approval for a proposed medical
9 office building at 7881 Auburn Road, and being permanent
10 parcel number 08-A-020-0-00-020-0. And what we're looking at
11 tonight, actually, two reviews related to that, a site plan
12 and a design review.

13 Is Mr. Capra here?

14 MR. CAPRA: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Could you step up to the mike,
16 sir, give us your name and address and kind of explain what
17 you're doing here.

18 MR. CAPRA: Marino Capra, 9076 Westwood Drive,
19 Kirtland. I have a building here already and we're just
20 building a twin. We were -- We wanted to build it a long time
21 ago. It's the same design. We -- The site plan, the site is
22 all completed, done, complete but the building needs to go up.
23 And it's 7,200 square foot medical office building, four
24 units.

25 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: So it's identical to the
26 existing building?

27 MR. CAPRA: Identical, yes, it's a twin.

28 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Nice looking building, by the
29 way.

30 MR. CAPRA: Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: And I noticed in the
2 documentation we have, obviously, there is no problem with
3 water provision or sewage provision. We did have some
4 comments from the Zoning staff.

5 Heather, did you want to go over those or do you
6 want me to read those?

7 MS. FREEMAN: You can go over those with the
8 applicant if you like.

9 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: The question is, can I find
10 them?

11 MS. FREEMAN: I emailed you this in advance as well,
12 so he is going to walk you through our staff recommendations
13 found on page 5.

14 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Yeah, which one? Oh, the one
15 with the --

16 MR. LINGENFELTER: Here.

17 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Okay. There were a number of
18 things that were brought to our attention from staff review
19 and, basically, the issues that were really boiled down to
20 were two. Let's see. Number 1, to revise the landscape plan
21 to match the civil plan layout. The landscape plan must show
22 the walk in the rear of the proposed building, as well as the
23 5 foot landscape area around the side and the rear. The
24 location of the dumpster enclosures is also incorrect.

25 So I don't know if -- Have you seen these concerns?

26 MR. CAPRA: Yes.

27 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Okay. And the second one then
28 was the location of an existing transformer which should be
29 confirmed by the electric company due to the possibility of it
30 having to be relocated. If it has to be relocated, a revised

1 site plan will be provided to the Zoning Department. Is that
2 an issue?

3 MR. CAPRA: No.

4 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: It can stay?

5 MR. CAPRA: It should stay. As far as the -- The
6 second building was already approved a long time ago. Okay?
7 So the site was built completely to accommodate both of those
8 buildings for medical office use. So the parking is there.
9 The transformer was an expensive thing to put in. That's in
10 for six buildings. It's something that we don't want to move.

11 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: And I don't know --

12 MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Chairman, I can make a response to
13 that?

14 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Yes.

15 MS. FREEMAN: He sited the new building exactly 15
16 feet away from an existing building, which is the bare minimum
17 of minimum distance between buildings in the Capital District.
18 So if they -- And, right now, the transformer location is
19 right up next to the building that he's proposing to build.
20 If he is not willing to move the transformer, then he's going
21 to have to come back and amend his site plan and, therefore,
22 what it sounds like is request a variance from the distance
23 between two buildings.

24 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Or move the building. Could you
25 move the building location? Would that -- Yeah, it probably
26 would because the concrete is already poured in the parking
27 lot, correct?

28 MR. CAPRA: Correct.

29 MR. LINGENFELTER: Well, let me ask you a question.

30 MR. CAPRA: Yes.

1 MR. LINGENFELTER: If you designed this originally
2 with both buildings in mind -- Right?

3 MR. CAPRA: Yes.

4 MR. LINGENFELTER: And if you put the transformer
5 where you did, then what's changed?

6 MR. CAPRA: Nothing has changed, just the zoning has
7 changed.

8 MS. FREEMAN: Well, this building is slightly larger
9 than what you had intended to do.

10 MR. CAPRA: No, identical.

11 MS. FREEMAN: It's not the same square footage.

12 MR. CAPRA: It's exactly 7,200 square feet. My
13 master plan calls for 6,000 square foot building, 7,200 square
14 foot building, 6,000 square foot building, 7,200 square foot
15 building, just like that all for six buildings. The master
16 plan is here. They don't -- They never pulled it up. But I
17 was approved for two buildings and these two buildings and
18 nothing has changed. And I have 66 parking spaces. They're
19 not marked because the building is not up. It's not necessary
20 for the first building.

21 MR. LINGENFELTER: Right.

22 MR. CAPRA: But they're all there. Everything was,
23 everything was put in, landscaping, all the trees. You name
24 it, it was put in. Water, we have 500 feet of -- and two fire
25 hydrants that we maintain. That's a lot for one building. I
26 think we've done a lot. And I think we should be allowed to
27 put in the second building just the way we designed it a long
28 time ago. It's the exact same plan.

29 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: And the issue of the transformer
30 then is safety or --

1 MS. FREEMAN: With all due respect, Mr. Capra, it is
2 not same plan.

3 MR. CAPRA: It's the exact same plan.

4 MS. FREEMAN: No, it's not. The plan that --

5 MR. CAPRA: I will bring you ---

6 MS. FREEMAN: This is the new plan.

7 MR. CAPRA: No. You asked me to revise it.

8 MS. FREEMAN: The only thing they're reviewing
9 tonight is the plan that you had your consultant, Harry
10 Jones --

11 MR. CAPRA: You weren't here when the first building
12 was built. Trust me, they're -- Like I said, 6,000 square
13 foot building, 7,200 square foot building, and they go in and
14 out, in and out.

15 MS. FREEMAN: Do you remember --

16 MR. CAPRA: Six of them.

17 MS. FREEMAN: Do you remember this year or in 2019
18 when you submitted this the first time to us and your civils
19 came in and the building footprint did not --

20 MR. CAPRA: No. You asked us to redo everything.

21 MS. FREEMAN: The building footprint was not the
22 same as what your architect had provided. There was a
23 mismatch in your new architectural renderings of the building
24 and site plan that Harry Jones prepared for you that we
25 pointed out to your consultant and then they went back and put
26 the slightly larger building in. This is not the exact same
27 building that you were, that you were previously approved for
28 that you never executed your right to build.

29 MR. CAPRA: Ten years ago, we were going to put up
30 the second building. The financial crisis happened, financing

1 got pulled. Now, at that time, we had a set of plans
2 completely approved by the zoning here and --

3 MS. GERMOVSEK: Do we have those plans?

4 MR. CAPRA: Yes, you do. That plan was changed.
5 The design of the building is not 7,000 square foot, it's a
6 little less, and it's a different design completely. And we
7 spent \$30,000. Why? To put in a second drive for the Fire
8 Department. We were going to fill the pond with tubing and to
9 retain the water and then fill it with sand and then drive
10 over it with a new drive for the Fire Department so they could
11 turn around for the second building, and the financing got
12 pulled.

13 Now I came back with the same exact approved plan
14 hoping that all they have to do is just put a check mark on it
15 and get started on it. No. That one, red flag. All of the
16 sudden, the county engineer that -- I brought a letter from
17 the Fire Department to the county engineer to get that
18 approved. It took a lot of time and money. Heather, first
19 thing, red flag because of that second driveway. She called
20 the county engineer and the county engineer will not approve
21 that again. It's too close to the other driveway according to
22 their zoning. Okay?

23 Fine. I said I will go back to my original plan and
24 that's it. I'll put the second building just the way I was
25 going to do it years ago, identical. No good. That's an old
26 plan. Okay.

27 I give it to an architect. This is the plan, just
28 put your name on it. Copy it, put your name on it. That's
29 what he did, Richard Beck, he did that. He's out of town.
30 Otherwise, he would be here to say just that. That's my

1 story.

2 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Okay.

3 MR. SCHINDLER: So, in other words, we didn't catch
4 the mistake the first time?

5 MR. CAPRA: No, they approved it the first time.
6 Zoning, everybody was on board with it.

7 MR. SCHINDLER: Well, we approved --

8 MS. FREEMAN: There was a conditional approval that
9 was granted with a very lengthy list of, you know, as you
10 know, we usually --

11 MR. CAPRA: It was a very short list.

12 MS. FREEMAN: -- with items that need to be checked
13 off. We went through that file before Mr. Capra resubmitted
14 for this plan just to verify to try to figure out how far in
15 the process did he get? Did he ever submit final site plan
16 that complied with all the regulations? Marty went through
17 that diligently and we did not find that he had submitted a
18 final site plan that met everything.

19 But to suggest that you could use a plan from ten
20 years ago and present that to the township or any other county
21 agency, those --

22 MR. CAPRA: Nothing changed in ten years,
23 commercial.

24 MS. FREEMAN: Licenses are old, they're outdated.
25 No one will take a ten-year-old plan. That's just not how
26 things happen.

27 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: So we don't have a new plan?

28 MR. CAPRA: Yes, you do have a new plan. I
29 redesigned the old plan from years ago and I went through all
30 the entire process from scratch as if I am starting new. I

1 had to show the existing fire hydrant, parking, landscaping,
2 and they're still not happy about the landscape design.

3 MR. LINGENFELTER: Well, you know, that's the point
4 of the --

5 MR. CAPRA: That's okay. That's a minor thing. I
6 am willing to accept that landscape design thing. That's,
7 that's minor.

8 MR. LINGENFELTER: I understand your frustration.

9 MR. CAPRA: Okay.

10 MR. LINGENFELTER: I get it. I understand. You
11 know, we're not here, we're not here to be adversarial in this
12 process.

13 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: It's certainly a beautiful
14 building.

15 MR. LINGENFELTER: We all want to see you build your
16 building --

17 MR. CAPRA: I hope you want to see me build it.

18 MR. LINGENFELTER: -- just like you want to build it
19 but things -- You know, ten years is a long time, right?
20 Things change.

21 MR. CAPRA: I believe that you are using my building
22 as a standard, my original building as a standard for when
23 they come here to apply. They -- Bruce, he said he would send
24 people to see that building. This is what we want it to look
25 like.

26 MR. LINGENFELTER: So this point Number 2 on the
27 staff recommendation, it says, "The location of the existing
28 transformer should be confirmed by the electric company as to
29 the possibility of being relocated. If this needs to be
30 relocated, a revised site plan shall be provide to do the

1 Zoning Department."

2 Has it been confirmed? I mean, is it -- What's the
3 status of that issue; do we know? Because we might -- The
4 reason I am asking is we might be making a big issue --

5 MR. CAPRA: Out of nothing.

6 MR. LINGENFELTER: -- out of something that really
7 doesn't need to be made an issue of, so -- because it says
8 "if." So has it been confirmed, yes or no? I mean, it's
9 pretty simple.

10 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: It hasn't been confirmed or it
11 has.

12 MS. FREEMAN: He would only know.

13 MR. CAPRA: They are arguing. They have to prove
14 their argument. I have no argument. I say it's done right.

15 MS. FREEMAN: No. Your engineer noted on the plan,
16 "may need to be moved after staking of Phase 2 building."

17 MR. LINGENFELTER: Right.

18 MR. CAPRA: You are asking to do that.

19 MS. FREEMAN: No, no.

20 MR. LINGENFELTER: So your --

21 MR. CAPRA: He's been working on this since February
22 of last year, by the way, back and forth. It's costing me a
23 fortune to do this just to put up the building. Since last
24 February, that's a long time.

25 MR. LINGENFELTER: Now, so then, so then let me ask
26 you a question. Is it going to, if you have to move the
27 transformer, okay, if you have to do that, that's going to
28 create a serious financial burden on you to do that?

29 MR. CAPRA: Most likely, yes.

30 MR. LINGENFELTER: Not most likely.

1 MR. CAPRA: It will be, yes. It's not something we
2 figured into building this, no.

3 MR. LINGENFELTER: So if you have to move the
4 transformer, then you're not going to do the building?

5 MR. CAPRA: We may not. It's a decision, you know
6 -- We may not do anything more here. You never know. It's a
7 decision we haven't made yet. All we're doing is throwing
8 money that this and nothing is getting done.

9 MR. LINGENFELTER: What has the electric company
10 said then? What have they said?

11 MR. CAPRA: No one has said anything except zoning.

12 MR. SCHINDLER: So, right now, we're waiting for the
13 electrical company to make a recommendation?

14 MR. CAPRA: I don't think she asked anybody.

15 MR. SCHINDLER: No.

16 MS. FREEMAN: No, I am not asking anyone. We just
17 pointed out, because we have seen several renditions of the
18 plan, you know. We went back and forth with Mr. Jones making,
19 you know, making sure things were mapped correctly. We told
20 him, you know -- One plan came in, there were 20 feet between
21 the building, which was great but it was the wrong size
22 building. So when they came back in with the right building
23 footprint, then they were too close together. So we advised,
24 you know, the engineer that the minimum distance is 15 feet.
25 He sent us back a new revised plan. It was labeled 15 feet
26 but it was still only 12 feet apart. So there was either a
27 labeling error or they didn't think we were going to check the
28 distance between the buildings.

29 But then now, finally, we have a plan that shows the
30 15 feet, which is a minimum, you know, distance. And this, as

1 you know, this Board can't grant a variance to that. That
2 would have to go in front of BZA if they didn't comply with
3 that.

4 So our concern and the only reason why we put it on
5 there was that we didn't think it would be actually feasible
6 to build the building as shown on here. And so, you know,
7 Harry Jones had indicated that, on his own site plan -- we
8 didn't ask him to put this on there -- that they may need to
9 move that transformer after they stake out Building 2.

10 MR. SCHINDLER: I think that issue is, right now, is
11 let's find out if the transformer has to be moved. If it
12 doesn't have to be moved, then I assume that answers
13 everybody's question. So if it doesn't --

14 MS. FREEMAN: And that's what all these are. These
15 are just --

16 MR. LINGENFELTER: Right.

17 MR. SCHINDLER: Right, I know.

18 MS. FREEMAN: If, after tonight, we conditionally
19 approve it and he agrees, yeah, I can live with all those
20 conditions, he goes back to the engineer, they modify, we
21 issue the permit, they stake out the building and, oh, like
22 this isn't going to work --

23 MR. LINGENFELTER: See, these are suggestions,
24 Mr. Capra.

25 MR. CAPRA: Yes.

26 MR. LINGENFELTER: Right? this is what the staff is
27 recommending in order for us to give you a conditional
28 approval. Okay? If you're in agreement that you're willing
29 to adhere to those recommendations, then it's our position to
30 grant you a conditional approval based on the recommendation,

1 you know, from the Zoning Inspector. So, you know, like I
2 said, we want to work with you. We want to see this, we want
3 to see your project go through.

4 MR. CAPRA: I want Concord to cooperate. That's
5 what I want.

6 MR. LINGENFELTER: Right. So --

7 MR. CAPRA: I am not getting cooperation. It's been
8 since February on this one project. That's a lot of time and
9 money and things that didn't need to be done. All this site
10 work was done already if she would have just used the original
11 plan.

12 MS. GERMOVSEK: But it was ten years old.

13 MR. CAPRA: No, that was 20 years old but nothing
14 has changed.

15 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Oh, 20?

16 MR. CAPRA: Yes, 18. It's 18 years old, that's a
17 fact.

18 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Okay, good, because I don't
19 remember it coming through here in the last ten years. Okay.
20 Well, most of these items, with the exception of that
21 transformer, most of these items are relatively easy to
22 correct.

23 MR. CAPRA: Very minor, yes.

24 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: And you could --

25 MR. CAPRA: After a year, yes, it's minor.

26 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: But they're not -- You're aware
27 of them and none of them are an issue except the transformer.
28 That's your only concern?

29 MR. CAPRA: Yes.

30 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Okay. And we don't even know

1 that that's an issue.

2 MR. CAPRA: Exactly.

3 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Until you talk to the electric
4 company.

5 MR. CAPRA: And how close is it? Is it an inch? Is
6 it a foot? Is it 5 feet?

7 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: And what's the requirement,
8 Heather, as far as how close can it be?

9 MS. FREEMAN: Marty, did you have something to add?

10 MR. PITKIN: There are certain stipulations that the
11 electric company requires when you place a transformer.

12 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Right.

13 MR. PITKIN: Three feet, ten feet.

14 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Okay.

15 MR. PITKIN: I am not aware of that. My point was
16 that he should contact the electric company --

17 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Yeah, just to confirm it.

18 MR. PITKIN: -- to see where the placement of the
19 transform is in respect to the building.

20 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Right.

21 MR. PITKIN: If it doesn't meet it, he'll have to
22 move it according -- not according to us.

23 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: According to them.

24 MR. PITKIN: According to them.

25 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Because that's an electric --

26 MS. GERMOVSEK: Yes.

27 MR. PITKIN: Yes. They're the governing body in
28 this.

29 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: I assume a safety aspect.

30 MR. PITKIN: That was my comment on that, was that

1 he should contact The Illuminating Company or whoever they are
2 to get that to check to see if it meets the required
3 distances.

4 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Okay. So it sounds like
5 everything else is easily resolved and you can take care of
6 that. But it also sounds like you need to get a hold of the
7 electric company just to confirm that you have the proper
8 space between from a safety standpoint. And if you do, there
9 is no issue. If you don't, then there is a problem. So --

10 MR. SCHINDLER: Not only that but Heather brings up
11 that it's not listed, the 12 feet, it's supposed to be 15
12 feet. That has to be addressed too, right?

13 MS. FREEMAN: Well, no.

14 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: It is currently.

15 MS. FREEMAN: This is drawn at 15 currently. I was
16 just giving you a little back story of all the different
17 renditions of the plan.

18 MR. SCHINDLER: Oh, okay. I stand corrected.

19 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: I mean, other than that, I think
20 this picture, that's a beautiful building and it would be an
21 asset to our community. I certainly see no problem with that
22 at all, just these issues which were given to us as a Board
23 that have to be considered. That seems to be a pretty
24 important one, the transformer, from the safety standpoint if
25 nothing else if an electric requirement from the energy
26 company, whoever.

27 MR. CAPRA: I feel confident it doesn't have to be
28 moved, so we can go ahead with your approval.

29 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: It would have to be conditional
30 upon that.

1 MR. CAPRA: Yeah.

2 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Okay.

3 MR. CAPRA: Yeah. We're not going to build over top
4 of it.

5 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Okay.

6 MR. CAPRA: Relax.

7 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: So you're willing to work with
8 whatever the electric company says?

9 MR. CAPRA: Electric company, yes.

10 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Is that acceptable, Heather? If
11 the electric company says it's okay, we're okay?

12 MS. FREEMAN: Right, because that's not a zoning
13 setback requirement. That was a concern, yeah.

14 MR. CAPRA: It is something they installed. They'll
15 want to move it if it has to be moved.

16 MS. GERMOVSEK: But the second building wasn't
17 there.

18 MR. CAPRA: It was designed for the second building,
19 that same building, same plan. I am not trying to pull
20 anything. It's all downstairs in the archives.

21 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Okay. So that's your site
22 review. And the other item we're talking about tonight is
23 your design review and the only issue was to revise the
24 dumpster detail to show the design and color of the dumpster
25 enclosure that matches the proposed building. No problem?

26 MR. CAPRA: No problem.

27 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Okay. So you will do that as
28 well.

29 MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Chairman, excuse me.

30 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Yes.

1 MS. FREEMAN: I think you missed two other things
2 under the site plan review.

3 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Oh, I thought we --

4 MR. LINGENFELTER: Four and five.

5 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Oh, okay.

6 MS. FREEMAN: Well, 3, 4 and 5. We kind of got
7 stuck on 2.

8 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: I thought those were included
9 when I made a comment about the dumpster. True. So let's
10 just go back to the site plan and say, the edge of the
11 existing pavement on the east side of the parking lot, you
12 have to show the actual edge of the pavement and proposed
13 grading of the new pavement. Not an issue?

14 MR. CAPRA: That's the engineer, he's paid for this.

15 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Okay. Item 4, revise all plans
16 to show the proposed walk continuing behind the proposed
17 building to connect to the existing walk on the west side and
18 extend it to connect to the parking area on the east side.
19 Handicap ramps on the existing and proposed sidewalk in the
20 parking lot should be considered. Anything there?

21 MR. CAPRA: The handicapped ramps, they're not in.
22 See, that's -- They don't understand the plan.

23 MS. FREEMAN: No. Reading the plans, they were not
24 provided. We're suggesting that you consider them.

25 MR. CAPRA: The ramps aren't in.

26 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Okay. You will put that on the
27 plan?

28 MR. CAPRA: Yeah, they'll -- No, no, they're not
29 existing is my point. The ramps aren't existing.

30 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Can you add those?

1 MR. CAPRA: Yes. When the building goes up, that's
2 when the ramps go in. Yes, it's in -- They're in the plan.

3 MS. FREEMAN: They weren't shown on the plans.
4 That's why we were asking you to consider including those in
5 on the plans.

6 MR. CAPRA: The site plan?

7 MS. FREEMAN: Right, the plans that we reviewed.

8 MR. CAPRA: The site plan?

9 MS. FREEMAN: Yeah.

10 MR. CAPRA: Site -- Her and the engineer, they've
11 been going back and forth since February. I paid him.
12 Just -- It's okay. Get it done.

13 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: So you will add those?

14 MR. CAPRA: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Okay. The last item then under
16 site would be revise the dumpster enclosure plan to comply
17 with Section 22.07 zoning, which states that any trash
18 receptacles are to be enclosed by three solid walls and one
19 gated wall of such nature, height -- and height, 2 foot height
20 exceeding the enclosed containers as to conceal completely all
21 operations thereafter from grade level. A 5 foot high
22 enclosure will not meet the enclosure requirement. So it's
23 currently 5. It needs to be higher.

24 MR. CAPRA: Whatever it needs to be done, the
25 engineer will take care of it. It's an easy fix for me. I
26 don't have to do a thing.

27 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Okay. And that will be put on
28 the plan?

29 MR. CAPRA: Yes.

30 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Okay. And resubmitted?

1 MR. CAPRA: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Okay. So now we're good on the
3 site plan. And the conditional for the design review is the
4 dumpster detail and the design and color of the dumpster and
5 so forth matching the building, and that will also be taken
6 care of?

7 MR. CAPRA: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: So everything that we just
9 talked about, you're good with, with the exception we have to
10 resolve the transformer.

11 MR. CAPRA: Uh-huh.

12 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Any comments, questions? Yes.

13 MS. PESEC: Vanessa Pesec, 11705 Cali Court. Just
14 on the plans -- Sorry. I will just grab it. On the plans for
15 the bathrooms --

16 MR. LINGENFELTER: I don't understand why she's
17 talking. I don't understand what's going on here. I'm sorry.

18 MS. PESEC: I'm sorry. I thought this was the
19 public comment portion.

20 MR. LINGENFELTER: No, this is just the --

21 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: This isn't a public hearing yet.

22 MR. LINGENFELTER: No, there is no public input
23 here, Vanessa.

24 MS. PESEC: Oh, okay.

25 MR. LINGENFELTER: Sorry.

26 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: You can bring that up later when
27 we have the public portion.

28 MS. PESEC: Oh, okay.

29 MR. LINGENFELTER: Yeah. This is just an
30 application review. This is not a. --

1 MS. PESEC: Oh, I thought it --

2 MR. LINGENFELTER: No.

3 MS. PESEC: I was just looking on the plans and I
4 saw something.

5 MR. LINGENFELTER: No.

6 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: We will give you an opportunity
7 to speak at another part of the agenda here, if you would
8 like.

9 MR. SCHINDLER: The audience portion.

10 MS. PESEC: You will already have approved this
11 continually, so it would be too late.

12 MR. CAPRA: Bathroom plans? There is no bathroom.
13 If someone moves in, then there will be a bathroom plan.

14 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Any other discussion on the
15 Board as far as anything?

16 Heather, do you have anything further?

17 MS. FREEMAN: No.

18 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Okay. Can we combine the vote
19 on this or do you want to do two separate?

20 MS. FREEMAN: You want to do two separate votes,
21 please.

22 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Okay. So do I have a motion to
23 approve the site plan conditionally with the understanding
24 that the issues that were brought forward will be addressed in
25 a revised site plan?

26 MR. LINGENFELTER: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion
27 that we accept the application being submitted, Number 039 by
28 Mr. Marino Capra, of Capra Business Center, LLC, for the --
29 with the consideration of the conditional issues, the five
30 conditional issues set forth in the staff report.

1 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Do I have a second for that
2 motion?

3 MS. GERMOVSEK: I second that.

4 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Okay, Sue seconds the motion.
5 Heather, do you want to call a vote, please?

6 MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Schindler?

7 MR. SCHINDLER: Yes.

8 MS. FREEMAN: Ms. Germovsek?

9 MS. GERMOVSEK: Yes.

10 MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Peterson?

11 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Yes.

12 MS. FREEMAN: And Mr. Lingenfelter?

13 MR. LINGENFELTER: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Okay. Conditionally approved on
15 the site plan.

16 As far as the design plan, do I have a motion to
17 approve the design with the exception of the one item that was
18 called out that still has to be addressed and has been agreed
19 to be addressed?

20 MR. LINGENFELTER: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, I will make
21 a motion that we accept Site Plan Review Application Number
22 039 submitted by Mr. Marino Capra, of Capra Business Center,
23 LLC, with the consideration of the single conditional approval
24 for recommendation for the design review application.

25 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Thank you. I have a motion. Do
26 I have a second?

27 MS. GERMOVSEK: I will second that.

28 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Okay. Sue will also second
29 that.

30 Heather, a vote, please.

1 MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Lingenfelter?

2 MR. LINGENFELTER: Yes.

3 MS. FREEMAN: Mr. Schindler?

4 MR. SCHINDLER: Yes.

5 MS. FREEMAN: Ms. Germovsek?

6 MS. GERMOVSEK: Yes.

7 MS. FREEMAN: And Mr. Peterson?

8 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Yes.

9 Okay. Both the site plan and the design review are
10 approved.

11 MR. CAPRA: Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: As long as we meet the
13 requirement, conditionally approved as long as we meet the
14 requirements.

15 MR. CAPRA: No worries. Thank you very much.

16 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Okay. Thank you.

17 Okay. Those items are completed. That's Items
18 Number 1 and Number 2 on the agenda.

19 Item Number 3 is a work session that we have this
20 evening and we're going to talk about existing residential
21 districts and housing types, and Heather has given us a
22 handout. And this is something we've talked about recently
23 where we talk about the different kinds of residential
24 developments that we have currently in the community and
25 looking forward.

26 And, Heather, I think I will turn this over to you
27 to kind of go through this handout that you gave us, if you
28 would, please.

29 MS. FREEMAN: Sure, okay. I have to regroup here
30 for a second. All right. So I did include a lot of

1 information in your packet. I don't know if everyone had time
2 to take a look at it or read through it. The first couple
3 handouts are just portions of our comprehensive plans. As you
4 know, we had a complete comprehensive plan done in 2004. What
5 I pulled out of there was just the section that kind of talked
6 about residential developments. What we were thinking in 2004
7 is still what we're thinking now as far as trying to promote
8 and encourage Residential Conservation District developments
9 as the zoning tool, which we did hear a lot of, you know,
10 testimony, I think, tonight in our preapplication meeting that
11 we're having some challenges, I think, with the way -- and
12 this is a little bit of a sidebar off topic what I was
13 planning on talking about tonight. But the way the RCD is
14 currently drafted in the zoning, the requirement of the yield
15 plan versus the RCD plan, and now that we've adopted riparian
16 setbacks, it's making it challenging not only for the
17 developers but also for staff. And I would think, you know,
18 the Zoning Commission and the Trustees moving forward, it's
19 going to be difficult to really assess the yield plan and
20 determine whether or not it's feasible and marketable and
21 economic, it makes sense economically.

22 I am thinking that we may want to revisit that RCD
23 District in the future to maybe make some amendments to that
24 on how we come up with a base density. We did talk about that
25 in the 2015 Comp Plan Update as far as the outcomes of these
26 RCD developments. Are we really getting what we thought we
27 were going to get? Do we need to make some changes?

28 Now, obviously, I wasn't here when we first adopted
29 the code. It's been -- How long have we had it in there,
30 maybe ten years roughly, right?

1 MR. SCHINDLER: At least ten years, yes.

2 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: About.

3 MS. FREEMAN: Yeah. It's a great option. We
4 definitely want the RCD versus the traditional R-1 but I'm
5 thinking that we may need to look at, you know, changing how
6 we review that to make sure that they aren't getting too much
7 based on some maybe a fictitious yield plan that would never,
8 ever be built.

9 MR. SCHINDLER: Question.

10 MS. FREEMAN: Yeah.

11 MR. SCHINDLER: What have you found over the years
12 since we've had it that there have been some maybe
13 discrepancies or some hardships that have come up that you
14 have found that really is something we should be targeting,
15 for example, based on the, you know -- Ten years is a long
16 time. The township has changed a lot in ten years.

17 MS. FREEMAN: Yeah. And I wasn't here for, you
18 know, when we did --

19 MR. SCHINDLER: Right.

20 MS. FREEMAN: -- Stone Ridge Estates initially.
21 When Concord Ridge came in, I joined the township after that
22 was already through the initial review process. And with
23 Concord Ridge, they -- we didn't have riparian setbacks at
24 that time. So like Mr. Sommers indicated, it was probably
25 easier for them to show us a yield plan and there really
26 wasn't as much scrutiny because we didn't have to worry about
27 whether or not there was a riparian, a setback from the stream
28 to warrant a lot buildable.

29 But I do know that there are cases -- And I don't
30 have figures with me or anything like that but maybe, as part

1 of that analysis, if we do decide that we're going to look at
2 that in the future would be to take a look at what RCDs were
3 approved, what they showed in their yield plan, what they got
4 in their density bonus, and what they ended -- what they
5 ultimately ended up building.

6 So some of them, they had got approved for a higher
7 density but, when they came down to the final engineering and
8 got to the county review process, they ended up not even
9 actually building as many lots that they thought they could
10 build based on, you know, our zoning process. When they
11 really got into the engineering of it, some of that just was
12 not feasible. Like they may have been approved for 61 but
13 they really only did 57 even though they looked like they got
14 that bonus. So --

15 MR. SCHINDLER: Based on what you are hearing from
16 the agencies now that we deal with --

17 MS. FREEMAN: Right.

18 MR. SCHINDLER: -- with the county and everything,
19 what have you found that's been maybe some issues that we
20 should be looking at more closely that you stumbled on over
21 the years?

22 MS. FREEMAN: As far as a review process or --

23 MR. SCHINDLER: Because of county regulations maybe
24 have changed to some degree, maybe state regulations have
25 changed since we developed this. Is there anything that's
26 been out there that we should really implement in this now at
27 this day and age?

28 MS. FREEMAN: I don't know. I guess I am just
29 learning from what we're doing right now. Even just these
30 last several months working with the Sommers Real Estate

1 development and there is, you know, they're upset because
2 they're putting a lot of money into the engineering where they
3 don't even know what they're going to get but really want to
4 build the RCD plan which, obviously, is the better idea, but
5 is it one, two, three lots too many based on the way they're
6 supposed to build the yield plan?

7 I think it really just has to do with the way our
8 specific Zoning Resolution is set up and how we set up the
9 density bonus. I don't know that that's a -- the perfect way
10 to do that anymore. Maybe, maybe it's, now, it's a time to
11 tweak that, revise that and I -- because, you know, like it
12 was brought up tonight, like Greg said, he could come back
13 with a yield plan and show that they are going to mitigate all
14 these wetlands and streams but, you know, how much do we want
15 to see the financial, the economics behind that, and do we
16 really want a developer to have to go through that
17 uncertainty?

18 Whereas, in other communities, they might allow like
19 a residential conservation development where you still have to
20 maybe rezone but there's clear parameters on you must have X
21 amount open space and your maximum density for the overall
22 project area is, you know, this number of houses per, you
23 know, per acre.

24 MR. SCHINDLER: Okay. This is something --

25 MS. FREEMAN: So then you come in, I have to do
26 this, this, this, but I can be flexible on my lot sizes and I
27 still have to make sure I have all the stream and wetlands
28 protected. And even like the way our code is written now,
29 we've always allowed detention areas to be located within the
30 open space. But maybe that's an opportunity, too, where, you

1 know, those detention basins, they still eliminate trees, you
2 know. But if we were to amend that code, I would probably
3 recommend that we say detention areas would be excluded from
4 your calculation of the open space because they're no longer
5 being protected, and maybe it's an opportunity to introduce
6 other things into subdivisions that maybe have been brought up
7 in our Comp Plan Update, you know, maybe requiring some
8 additional trees to be planted within the development on
9 individual sublots or -- because it is, you know, a unique
10 development.

11 So if we can save developers cost on like the
12 preengineering and the yield plan, maybe they'd be willing to
13 put in something a little bit better, you know, for the
14 township, kind of sidebarring here.

15 MR. SCHINDLER: I know with water, for example,
16 there's a determination whether you have dry retention basins
17 versus wet. And if you have a dry one, you're not supposed to
18 be planting in there, for one thing, and people already start
19 to do that because they think it's nice. But then by doing
20 that, you're not heeding what the basin was planned to do,
21 hold water, when you have trees and everything else in there.
22 But these are things, I believe, we already have them in our
23 regulation now right, that they can and can't do that, for
24 example.

25 MS. FREEMAN: We don't regulate anything with the
26 detention basins other --

27 MR. SCHINDLER: That's part of --

28 MS. FREEMAN: That's part of the county.

29 MR. SCHINDLER: -- the county's responsibility.

30 MS. FREEMAN: Yeah. They let them know what they

1 can and cannot do with those basins.

2 MR. SCHINDLER: Okay.

3 MS. FREEMAN: The only -- We basically just say you
4 have to show them somewhere and then we leave the county to,
5 you know, as far as this, our township review process before
6 it gets submitted formally to the county for the subdivision
7 requirements.

8 MR. SCHINDLER: Okay.

9 MS. FREEMAN: We wouldn't really address that other
10 than maybe saying, if it's in the open space, we're going to
11 subtract that area out from the open space calculation.

12 MR. SCHINDLER: Okay.

13 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: So you're saying we should
14 better, really better define it so it's less nebulous for us
15 and for the developer.

16 MS. FREEMAN: I think it would be, yeah, I mean, if
17 it's the preferred mechanism, you know, of the township still
18 to move forward, which I believe it still is, I mean.

19 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Yeah. You compare the R-1 that
20 we looked at tonight and the conservation, there's day and
21 night. Obviously, we want the conservation.

22 MS. FREEMAN: If we can keep those environmentally
23 sensitive areas off of sublots, it reduces the likelihood of
24 an individual property owner going in and doing something.

25 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Right.

26 MS. FREEMAN: There is challenges of HOAs and
27 everything being in charge of open space. There is
28 preferences to have conservation-minded organizations monitor
29 those but, you know, that's another issue with the
30 development.

1 But even with the RCDs, you know, we're not getting
2 back to why we originally started looking at housing and
3 everything. We're not getting, you know, more like smaller
4 houses that might be geared towards, you know, seniors or
5 millennials and stuff like that because we're still getting,
6 you know, they're going to build like \$400,000 homes on the
7 lots and sell them for \$90,000.

8 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Yeah, 3,500 square feet.

9 MS. FREEMAN: Yeah. They're still going to be,
10 like, large family homes. So the RCD tool probably wouldn't
11 be, you know, if we determined that we needed housing geared
12 towards the independent living or the seniors, I don't know
13 that we would get that with the RCD.

14 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Yeah.

15 MS. FREEMAN: Or that we would need that. We're
16 still having that conversation.

17 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: I agree because I think there is
18 sort of a gap there. I was looking through our R-5 that we
19 used to have and everything. And when this says "senior,"
20 it's really talking senior, kind of, like Parker Place maybe
21 in Mentor. I think there is an age gap there from maybe age
22 50 to maybe age 80 where people are not really old where they
23 need Parker Place but they want to have smaller houses and
24 things like that and less yard to take care of. We sort of
25 don't hit that area too much in our zoning.

26 MS. FREEMAN: Right.

27 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: It's not senior but it's over
28 50, you might call it or something, you know. But I know we
29 have a lot of condos in here.

30 MS. FREEMAN: Yeah.

1 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: But, you know, that's about all
2 we have. And when these developments come in, like the ones
3 that we have going on right now or possibly going in, it would
4 be nice to see those houses that are 2,000 square feet, you
5 know, ranches, things like that, more of that in the township
6 as opposed to the 3,500 square foot colonials, which we have
7 thousands of.

8 And you point out trends in building and buying last
9 meeting, I think it was, and the trend is to go away from
10 those bigger places with the younger generation. And so
11 mostly what we keep getting are the big, beautiful homes,
12 which they're nice but it doesn't cover all aspects of the
13 people in the community.

14 So when I looked at senior residential, I think
15 there is two levels of senior.

16 MS. FREEMAN: Right.

17 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Over 50 and maybe over 80. I
18 don't know.

19 MS. FREEMAN: Yeah, we will get into that a little
20 bit. I was going to touch base on that.

21 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Okay.

22 MS. FREEMAN: But, sorry, back to what -- the
23 portion of the 2004 Comp Plan Update, we do talk about some
24 recommendations in here to provide for limited amount of,
25 like, the R-3 developments, cluster, possibly senior oriented.
26 So we've been talking about seniors and senior-oriented
27 developments as early as 2004 and we're continuing to have
28 that conversation to figure out, you know, do we need to
29 provide those different alternatives? If so, where should
30 they go? Are they naturally forming into, like, senior

1 housing little areas or do we need a separate zoning
2 designation specifying, you know, 55 and over?

3 So in the '04 plan update, this is talking basically
4 about the R-3 and, you know, the general locations of where
5 they may be acceptable, which is basically the same thing
6 that's currently in the Zoning Resolution. It doesn't look
7 like any of that has changed at all but that purpose statement
8 of R-3 has remained the same for the last 16 years.

9 But in the 2015 when we did the update for the Comp
10 Plan -- and I know this is not the first time you looked at
11 that -- there are, you know, some recommendations on here that
12 we did do a few years ago and we looked at the R-5 and the
13 Comp Plan Update. They weighed some of the pros and cons the
14 challenges as to maybe why it never took off. And then,
15 ultimately, the township decided that that was not the tool
16 that we wanted to use anymore and that's why we ended up
17 removing it from the Zoning Resolution.

18 They're also suggesting in here that, you know, we
19 should take into consideration whether or not R-3 could be a
20 tool to provide, to provide senior housing developments, which
21 Ralph Victor Construction's initial partner with the
22 Kettlebrick Farms was trying to utilize the R-3 for. He was
23 trying to do an independent living development under the R-3.
24 The sense was that that, obviously, was not the appropriate
25 location, which is why the main reason, I believe, that it was
26 turned down.

27 But that shows that maybe we don't need a specific
28 designation, a specific district just to promote senior
29 housing. But if we do decide that we do want this kind of
30 development, which is why we have the subsequent map later on,

1 maybe we can talk about, you know, if it were to happen, maybe
2 it would go over here but not over there or just kind of work,
3 talk about some of those ideas, get your input on where you're
4 at with that.

5 So I did resurrect the R-5 and I did a quick summary
6 of that. I mean, the whole Resolution is only four pages
7 anyway, so I probably didn't need to summarize it. But,
8 basically, you -- it was a self-contained senior residential
9 community. There was a very specific list of permitted uses.
10 You could do independent living, assisted living, rest home
11 facilities. It had to be all in one large campus, all under
12 one operator, one owner. There were, there were specific
13 percentages of the number of dwelling units that could be used
14 towards the single detached or attached dwelling units, so
15 there had between 10 to 40 percent of the total units proposed
16 for the project. And then as far as assisted living, you had
17 to be between 20 and 50 percent. And then for nursing/rest
18 home, between 10 and 60 percent of the total units. So not to
19 exceed 100 percent, obviously, by the time you laid it all
20 out.

21 Minimum lot size: 50 acres. One common owner, I
22 think that was probably the hard, the challenging thing
23 because that's not always common. You don't always get one
24 individual that's coming in and is providing that entire
25 continuum of care, like, the full breath of, you know, like
26 the Breckenridge.

27 There were minimum lot width, 500 feet, 100 foot of
28 frontage. They did specify a maximum density of land area per
29 dwelling unit. So it was, you had to have at least 4,250
30 square feet of land area per dwelling unit, which is,

1 basically, equates to ten units per acre, if you do the math,
2 which a maximum number of 500, 500 total units. So there was
3 overall cap of total number of units and a certain amount of
4 land area had to be accounted for for each unit.

5 Maximum building height: 30 feet -- 35 feet. So
6 we're not talking a big story building either, no higher than
7 35 feet.

8 But so I think what maybe we could learn from the
9 R-5 is that at one point we were open to having this type of
10 development somewhere in the township. Since then though
11 we've had the Concord Village skilled nursing facility come in
12 on Capital Parkway, which is a nursing home. I believe they
13 have around 80 units in that building. I apologize. I meant
14 to look that up before I came tonight. I know the assisted
15 living that is just not that far away from that on Auburn
16 Road, they have a total of 94 units in there, 70 of them
17 devoted to the assisted living and 24 for memory care,
18 Alzheimer-type patients. And I guess the only thing that, you
19 know, was suggested in this former R-5 district that we don't
20 necessarily have in the township already would be these
21 independent dwelling units, you know, deed restricted, age 55
22 and over.

23 So one thing I found interesting, I couldn't find
24 anything that the township had gone through and actually tried
25 to figure out, if we did the R-5, where would they want it?
26 You know, there really wasn't anything in any of the plans
27 that I saw that suggested, you know, what a suitable location
28 for that would be.

29 I think, you know, as -- When we got Lake Health
30 move into Concord Township, that really changed us and changed

1 what's happening over on Auburn Road and it really started to
2 turn into this more of a medical corridor. And the Concord
3 Village skilled nursing facility, that operator had a very
4 close relationship with Lake Health and that was one of the
5 reasons why they chose the location over on Capital Parkway,
6 because they do lease out to Lake Health a couple wings of
7 that building for rehab facility. So they have a very good
8 working relationship between those two entities.

9 And then after the skilled nursing facility came in,
10 a couple years later, the same developer that brought us the
11 skilled nursing worked to bring the assisted living facility
12 on Auburn Road. And I know that they're hoping that the
13 township would be open to some kind of independent living as
14 part of what they think, you know, that the market is showing
15 that we need. But, as you know, we haven't gone through those
16 steps to determine, you know, if someone were to want to do
17 that, you know, would we be okay with that and what does it
18 look like and where does it go? And that was one of the main
19 recommendations from the Planning Commission is to, you know,
20 when that rezone application came in with the Kettlebrick
21 Farms, that we hadn't gone through that exercise.

22 So as part of just my information gathering, a
23 couple years ago, our staff had started working on mapping and
24 just trying to get a handle on where all of our multi-family
25 type developments were at. And so I did provide you with,
26 like, this Excel spreadsheet. It's kind of colored coded
27 here. It kind of shows you all the condominium developments
28 within the township, ranging from Aria's Way, which is zoned
29 -- it actually has two different zoning districts because it
30 was developed at two different times and we talked about this

1 in the past -- but R-1 and R-3. They have duplexes and
2 single-family detached cluster there. They're condominium, so
3 the people own those. With the majority of these multi-family
4 developments are condominiumized, so they can be owned units,
5 the units can be owned.

6 We have a couple rental multi-family developments
7 and these were -- these are pretty old. Cobblestone Estates
8 in the B-1, that was probably built in the '60s or '70s. I
9 wish I would have a column "dates." That would have been
10 interesting to see but I didn't have it at this time. But --

11 So this was more of an information piece for you and
12 then I kind of totaled some things up here at the bottom. Of
13 these roughly like 2,000 units that were approved, about
14 almost 1,500 of them are located within developments that have
15 the attached three to eight units per building. A few of them
16 are duplexes, 80 units, and then there are some that have the
17 two to three units per building. Those ones are located in
18 the Quail Hollow development because right now that's not an
19 option really in any other district.

20 And then the single-family detached cluster, we were
21 able to extract those out and try to figure out, you know, how
22 many of those are in the township as well and there is 404.
23 So these fall under the multi-family districts because they're
24 part of the R-3 or they may be part of the R-2, the planned
25 unit development.

26 I had maps for every single one of these
27 developments but I didn't want to print all that out, so I can
28 email that to people who want to see that. So I did just a
29 couple like, kind of, general maps that show you the location
30 of where some of these more concentrated areas of the multi-

1 family are located. So the first one is kind of the northwest
2 corner of the township, basically, right on our Mentor border
3 of Old Johnnycake, you know. That's where a lot of R-3
4 developments are, including Aria's Way just a little bit
5 further down.

6 And the yellow will make sense to you later.

7 So then the other area of the township we're seeing
8 a lot of multi-family developments, actually, is in the Quail
9 Hollow development. So Players Club, Stonehaven, some of
10 these are the cluster dwellings and some of these are attached
11 units. And you can always go back to the table if you want to
12 see what's exactly within those different developments.

13 And then on the other map, it's kind of the Prouty
14 Road area, Lockwood Ridge, Hillshire Woods and Hampton Bay,
15 Water Oaks, Auburn Hills. What's interesting about Auburn
16 Hills is this is a case where it's zoned R-1 but the code
17 allowed a developer to come in and show that they could create
18 hypothetical lots that would potentially comply with the R-1
19 districts and then what they did is they set it up as a
20 condominium association and put a private street in.

21 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: I wondered about that because
22 that's a nice development.

23 MS. FREEMAN: Yeah. I mean, the density is the same
24 as, you know, a regular R-1 but I think it was a cost savings
25 from the developer standpoint to do it this way because they
26 didn't have to do a public street which costs lot more money
27 for the developer.

28 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: This map is excellent and one of
29 the things it kind of pointed out is really we don't have
30 those big 50-acre lots for an R-5 as it was previously defined

1 anyway.

2 MS. FREEMAN: Right.

3 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Anything we have that's really
4 large is east of Ravenna Road and, most of the time, you get
5 out there and you don't have water and sewer and things like
6 that.

7 MS. FREEMAN: Well, right, but this map was -- You
8 guys had asked me to take a look at what lots were 10 acres or
9 larger. So I did a query in GIS to figure out, you know,
10 which lots were 10 acres or greater. I kind of, like, took
11 out all the ones that the Metroparks owned, which is why I
12 highlighted those. They own currently about 1,600 acres of
13 land within the township. So you will see those with the
14 green and the white on the map. As far as that goes, I would
15 say those are permanently protected. I don't know that they
16 would ever give those up.

17 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Yeah.

18 MS. FREEMAN: It also mapped with the darker green
19 other areas that are protected land, so those might be deed
20 restricted open space for subdivisions, conservation
21 easements. You pointed out I missed one of the parks over
22 here off Hoose, so I will add that one in.

23 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Concord Hills, yeah.

24 MS. FREEMAN: You know, the open space in the RCD
25 and the PUD. And then there is actually the, on the east side
26 of the township, the history museum owns some land in Concord
27 Township. So I found that interesting when I was doing my
28 research.

29 Then I just kind of mapped for your reference the
30 golf courses. The golf course that runs through Quail Hollow,

1 I don't think that that's likely that that would ever be
2 turned into a housing development. Most of that, you know, is
3 the open space for the PUD, so it wouldn't be an opportunity
4 there. And even with the Little Mountain Country Club, that's
5 a special district that, you know, I don't think that that
6 could be turned into housing.

7 Then I did also map, just for your reference, there
8 are a couple subdivisions that are currently in development
9 off of Winchell Road. That's the Lilly Farm. That's an RCD
10 where he is doing about 24 lots and that was a relatively easy
11 RCD to review because there weren't any streams and wetlands,
12 so there really wasn't as much scrutiny on the yield plan.
13 Then we have the Stone Ridge Estates off of Girdled Road, the
14 Phase 3. The developer is trying to finalize, get his final
15 improvement plans approved by the county.

16 As you know, Bill Martin, off of Crile, off Hunting
17 Lake Drive, that Phase 10 of Quail Hollow, that's going to be
18 about 50 lots. Those are, you know, regular lots, between,
19 you know, about a third of an acre is probably the average
20 size. And that's where Pulte is actually going in there and
21 building. And what's interesting about that development is --

22 MS. GERMOVSEK: Where is that?

23 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Hunting Ridge.

24 MS. FREEMAN: Oh, right here.

25 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Hunting Ridge Drive.

26 MS. GERMOVSEK: Next to --

27 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Hunting Lake, Hunting Lake will
28 tie in.

29 MS. FREEMAN: Right here, that blue area right
30 there.

1 That, Bill Martin is selling those lots to Pulte
2 Homes and they're actually doing, the majority of those are
3 going to be slab homes, you know, maybe --

4 MS. GERMOVSEK: Ranch.

5 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: The model homes that they are
6 providing were on slabs. Was it a ranch?

7 MR. PITKIN: Yeah, ranches.

8 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Yeah, I think they are.

9 MS. FREEMAN: Yeah, ranch, like two, maybe three
10 bedrooms. So I don't know if that continues to go in that
11 trend, like, this naturally may turn into, you know, an area
12 where people could downsize that already live in the
13 community. I don't know if we're going to be able to do
14 three-car garages or not.

15 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: I've got my name on the list
16 there. Yeah, they are supposed to start that in April.

17 MS. FREEMAN: They were pushing to get that done,
18 yeah, to get through the approval process, yes.

19 Then also in purple on here are all the different
20 condominium developments that, you know, relate to that,
21 multi-family/condominium developments that relate back to the
22 table here.

23 But then the yellow, these are the 10-acre parcels
24 that are kind of left out there. Now, obviously, some of
25 these are probably already developed. There is things here.
26 For example, right over by the northwest area where we have
27 that concentration of multi-family, that's St. Gabe's but
28 that's over 10 acres. So there is, just down 84 across, kind
29 of across the street from that, that's just owned by a private
30 individual -- their house is actually on the white lot right

1 in the middle of that -- but that's got future potential
2 development.

3 MS. GERMOVSEK: Is that in the Brightwood area
4 there?

5 MS. FREEMAN: Right outside of Brightwood, yeah,
6 just south of Brightwood.

7 Then just kind of moving south, well, the large area
8 by Morley and Pinecrest, I mean, that's currently Lake Erie
9 College.

10 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Right.

11 MS. FREEMAN: It's highly unlikely. Then just
12 further down from there south, that's owned by a private
13 individual who may determine that they want to sell it for
14 development in the future. So that's over 10 acres.

15 But so there is -- I did a calculation. There's
16 roughly 2,600 acres of land out there that each parcel is at
17 least 10 acres or larger. I didn't go through and, on each
18 one, and kind of figure out whether or not it would actually
19 be developed or not but just looking at it and knowing you
20 guys are familiar with what's here in the township, we can,
21 more than likely, rule some of these out.

22 But even, like, you have to remember, too, because
23 down, like, tonight when we had the preapp, Sommers
24 development, where they're doing east of Timberlane, the land
25 there, I mean, they assembled a couple parcels that
26 individually they're not 10 acres but collectively they are.
27 So there is other opportunities that maybe aren't captured on
28 here but this kind of gives you a general idea of where, what
29 parcels are currently 10 acres or greater.

30 I thought this would be a good kind of discussion

1 point if you guys wanted to talk more about R-3 and, you know,
2 if we were going to have that or what your thoughts were on
3 using that as a tool to possibly promote independent living.
4 You know, Rich talked about, do we, when we talk about senior
5 housing or independent living, are we looking at like a
6 Breckenridge or a Parker Place or, you know, is it just lower
7 maintenance houses and we let the market kind of dictate and
8 do private deed restrictions as, you know, the one development
9 team was proposing to do? Do we want to get into writing a
10 specific zoning for it or do we want to use what we already
11 have? And if we want to use what we already have in there,
12 okay. Where do we want to see more R-3 if somebody were to
13 come in with it?

14 When we talked about the independent living at those
15 hearings, it was brought up that Prouty Road location was so
16 far away from everything that it just didn't seem like the
17 right place and some of the discussion was that it's usually
18 closer to the services that they use, those individuals may
19 need.

20 I believe the applicant had stated that, originally,
21 they would have preferred to be closer to where the skilled
22 nursing facility and assisted living are currently located.
23 So I don't know. Is there land over there that might be
24 suitable for that type of development?

25 MR. SCHINDLER: The land is suitable. I asked him
26 about it, why didn't he go there, and he said too expensive.

27 MS. FREEMAN: Too expensive.

28 MR. SCHINDLER: Yeah. He didn't want to spend the
29 money for it. They were asking too much money for it. He
30 said, "Yes, I agree with you. It would have been ideal.

1 That's where we should have put it." He said, "But I wasn't
2 about to spend the money for the land to put it there." So --
3 But there again, if you call it senior living, you want the
4 places to be close to the amenities for seniors because they
5 want to have easy access to go to places. A lot of them just
6 like to go for a walk. And if you can put it somewhere where
7 we can go for a walk and go to the store -- Like when I was
8 growing up, you used to have a little store on the corner, you
9 know, where you went for your meat and stuff like that.
10 That's what they're looking for.

11 MS. GERMOVSEK: They're little communities.

12 MR. SCHINDLER: Yeah, little communities where you
13 can socialize, too.

14 MS. GERMOVSEK: Right.

15 MR. SCHINDLER: How many times have I stopped at a
16 McDonald's in the morning maybe for an Egg McMuffin and there
17 is elderly all in there for the breakfast and it's a place
18 they find to get together and socialize and have their little
19 muffin and breakfast and then they go home. And that's what
20 you we should be looking for something to do in our township,
21 for that to happen. How many smaller homes? We all know we
22 have to get into smaller homes. Times are changing with the
23 environment and everything. We see where things are going.
24 These big houses, people can't afford to heat and cool them
25 anymore. They don't need it.

26 My home that I bought was supposed to be my first
27 home, stepping stone to my big place. I am glad I never went
28 to the big place because, right now, it's 1,900 feet and it's
29 fine for my wife and I, you know.

30 MS. FREEMAN: Right.

1 MR. SCHINDLER: And push comes to shove -- it's a
2 colonial -- but if push comes to shove, I can get a thing to
3 take me upstairs, you know, the power to get me upstairs to
4 the bedrooms. But the thing of it is it's small and it easy
5 to maintain and I have a small yard. This is where we have to
6 go. Not only the older people but younger generation wants
7 this today.

8 MS. GERMOVSEK: I feel the younger generation --

9 MR. SCHINDLER: You know, they're moving downtown
10 Cleveland in small apartments and condos. They don't want to
11 be out there. They want to be where the activity is, you
12 know, and it's -- I think that's the trend.

13 And I think we have, we have a good thing to do,
14 like, with the R-5. Whether we want to call it senior living,
15 I don't know, because there is a --

16 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: No.

17 MR. SCHINDLER: -- stigma about senior living
18 because, quote, people right away refer that to be, oh, closer
19 homes, everybody is jammed in like sardines, so they don't
20 like to hear that. Even though they like to do it for --

21 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Yeah. You look at something
22 like The Villages in Florida, that's 55 and older but it
23 doesn't look like Parker Place.

24 MR. SCHINDLER: I know, I know. We have friends
25 that live down there, too.

26 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Yeah. That's bigger than all of
27 Concord though.

28 MR. SCHINDLER: Oh, I know.

29 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: But you would think the market
30 would demand or drive smaller homes, you know, in

1 developments. I was kind of surprised when I saw the
2 development that we discussed tonight having 3,500 square foot
3 homes, big mansions, you know.

4 MS. FREEMAN: Right.

5 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: We've got a lot of that already.

6 MS. FREEMAN: I know. And a lot of that has to do
7 with the cost of doing, you know, being a developer. And if
8 you have to sell a lot for 80 to 90 thousand dollars, no one
9 is going to build a \$200,000 house on there.

10 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: True, I know.

11 MS. FREEMAN: They're going to build like a 3 or 4
12 hundred thousand dollar house. And I have no idea how much
13 developers make off these, you know, subdivisions but it is --
14 it's market driven.

15 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Right.

16 MS. FREEMAN: When you require certain size lots,
17 you know, prices go up.

18 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Right.

19 MS. FREEMAN: So if you have like in the R-1, like
20 even tonight, for example, that yield plan they showed on the
21 R-1, they had 43 lots and the roadway went, you know, almost
22 all the way to the north. So that was a lot more roadway
23 length, which means more cost and 43 lots. But if they could
24 reduce the cost of building the infrastructure and get more
25 lots on a lesser amount of frontage, then the overall cost for
26 the project per lot is less.

27 MR. SCHINDLER: Sure.

28 MS. FREEMAN: So then, potentially, they could sell
29 those lots for a little bit cheaper but -- And even like from
30 a township perspective, less road maintenance. But we're not,

1 for whatever reason, we're not getting like, you know, the
2 entry-level type, you know, homes. The builders really aren't
3 building them. They're still kind of building the bigger
4 homes, specifically in northeast Ohio. I mean, the square
5 footage is still, you know, large even though there is still a
6 demand from, you know, millennials for smaller homes but
7 they're buying, you know, like your house. You're finally
8 ready to move out and they're moving into existing
9 neighborhoods, you know, and fixing them up and then people
10 like you are moving over to HyGrove and --

11 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: You're right.

12 MS. FREEMAN: -- to a newer house but it's smaller
13 than what you're currently in and, you know, that's just kind
14 of what --

15 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: And it is driven by the cost of
16 the land because anywhere in Concord you are looking at half
17 acre improved lot, \$90,000 for a half acre, and go out to
18 Geauga County, you get 10 acres for that, you know. So it's a
19 big difference.

20 MR. SCHINDLER: Yeah. I remember one time my wife
21 and I decided to put the house up for sale just to see what we
22 were going to get. And we sat in the yard of our next door
23 neighbor's yard and we had an open house and the families
24 coming in, you know, two children, and they were just jumping
25 up and down, "Oh, Mommy, look at this house. My room's here."
26 And I thought to my wife after we had the open house, I says,
27 "You know, Hon, I don't think I want to move." But they
28 wanted to get into a smaller house.

29 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Yeah.

30 MR. SCHINDLER: You had St. Gabe's up there. You

1 had everything right there. And they were just waiting and
2 they made an offer for the house, which I was surprised
3 because I got more than what I was asking for. They wanted to
4 buy it that day. And I thought to myself, man, you know. But
5 this is the trend, smaller but close to amenities, not only
6 for the younger families but also for the seniors. They want
7 to do the same thing. So if we can do our best to try give
8 them that, I think that's what the trend will eventually be
9 because of the way things are happening today in our world.
10 The cost is going up so high. I mean, you hear about these
11 poor families that want to buy affordable homes and they can't
12 find any.

13 I watched a program the other day on California
14 where people are living in their, you know, their cars because
15 they can't find affordable houses. They have a minimal
16 income. Even though they're both working, they still can't
17 afford a home in California because, well, we know what homes
18 go for in California. They're extremely expensive. But
19 that's happening all over the country now and it's a shame. I
20 think we have to start looking for that trend, not only what's
21 affordable as far as buying a home but to be able to sustain
22 the home with the utilities and everything else that's
23 required to be able to live in a house today.

24 So how we can achieve that needs work but I would
25 like to be able to come up with something we can massage to
26 have to hit those markets but have the flexibility to the
27 developer like we have with conservation zoning right now. If
28 we can find a way to duplicate that kind of theme to allow
29 this kind of development to take place, I think that would be
30 very helpful, allow them that kind of flexibility.

1 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: You're talking like creating a
2 new kind of R-5 that would define what you are talking about?

3 MR. SCHINDLER: Yes, exactly, exactly.

4 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Which would have to allow them
5 to build on much smaller lots to make it profitable.

6 MR. SCHINDLER: Correct, correct. Make it
7 profitable for them because they have to make a living but you
8 have to make it desirable for the families that want to get in
9 that type of living, too, that can afford to get into that
10 type of living. Now, I know right now they build five and a
11 half million dollar homes but that trend is going to start, I
12 think, dwindling over time based on just what's happening
13 today, you know, like I say, with global warming and the cost
14 of things going up and it's going to become astronomical. So
15 it's going to be favorable not only for senior citizens but
16 for the younger generation now that want to live in smaller
17 homes. They don't need bigger homes.

18 It is funny because when I spent six months one time
19 in Europe, in Germany, on business, if you go to Germany and
20 see the homes that are built there over the years -- I went,
21 we went to see a president of one of the companies I was
22 representing over there. He is the president of the company
23 and we went to see his house. This house was smaller than
24 mine and he was very happy. But this is how they build them
25 because, first of all, energy efficiency. The Europeans know
26 the cost of keeping down what it cost to heat, like, a bigger
27 home is astronomical overseas. So that's why they're way
28 ahead of us in energy, you know, looking at solar, looking at
29 wind. But they've been doing that for years and years and
30 years because they see what's been going on and they don't

1 want big houses and they're satisfied to have smaller homes
2 and stuff.

3 But we have to do that in this country, too, if we
4 expect to be able to serve the culture that we have in this
5 country, be it the elderly or be it the younger generation
6 that sees, you know, that we can't afford this big stuff
7 anymore because it's just too costly to live in a place that
8 that's big and you want to keep things smaller.

9 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Would a logical next step be to
10 better define our conservation district, like you talked
11 about, the parameters of it so it's easier for us to
12 administer and easier for developers to understand? Is that
13 something we could work on? Do you have any formula or
14 calculation on how that would go together?

15 MS. FREEMAN: No, not yet, no. Yeah, that's --

16 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: That might be a logical next
17 step to resolve that problem.

18 MS. FREEMAN: Right.

19 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Because that's the direction I
20 think we want to go.

21 MS. FREEMAN: Right.

22 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: The conservation district. And
23 you talked about defining that better, make it clearer.

24 MS. FREEMAN: Right.

25 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: And that might lead us into some
26 other things that you're talking about.

27 MR. SCHINDLER: Right.

28 MS. FREEMAN: But I guess I'm looking maybe for a
29 sense from you guys as far as, do you feel like it's worth
30 looking into like more, you know, promoting independent living

1 or do we want it? Where do we want it? Do we want to zone
2 for independent living or do we want to just see naturally
3 what happens within developments as they build? I mean --

4 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: How do you define "independent
5 living"?

6 MS. FREEMAN: Right. I mean, so in the former R-5
7 district, we specifically said independent living units, age
8 55 and over.

9 MS. GERMOVSEK: Exclusively, yeah, they can only
10 have one spouse. I mean, I feel that's too strict.

11 MS. FREEMAN: Is that something we want to do or do
12 we want to see how we can utilize the R-3 for someone to come
13 in and actually utilize that? But that was part of the
14 concern is, like, you have a developer coming in and saying,
15 "Well, I am doing this project," but you have Option A, B and
16 C and he's telling you, "I am going to do B and then maybe
17 come and do C later on."

18 So we still have to, you know, I think if the
19 township wanted to try to accommodate independent living, we
20 definitely have to set it up as a Planned Unit Development.
21 And, that way, if the developer came in and wanted to propose
22 that somewhere, you're reviewing a plan along with the
23 proposed terms of the development.

24 But even before that, I think, you know, maybe we
25 need to even -- and maybe we can't do all this tonight. We
26 can have -- maybe I need get back information to you. But,
27 you know, what general areas in the township can you rule out
28 where you would not want to see more R-3 or some version of an
29 R-5? You know, I, I don't know what your thoughts are but I
30 personally think anything that's zoned R-4, we would not want

1 to see, you know, any higher density than the RCD option. But
2 where else would you possibly entertain that idea, or maybe
3 nowhere? I don't know.

4 When we talked about the Town Center and the master
5 plan for the Town Center, one of the things that was brought
6 up was that, you know, we don't have enough households over
7 there to support, you know, the ultimate goal of getting a
8 mixed, true mixed-use development.

9 MS. GERMOVSEK: Mixed use.

10 MS. FREEMAN: So is there possibly an opportunity to
11 provide that, those increased households, you know, maybe near
12 where we were hoping for the Town Center and close to the
13 assisted living and the skilled nursing facility, near, which
14 would be right across, you know, 44, Capital Parkway to where
15 all the retail is? You know, is that a better general
16 location?

17 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: There is just not that much land
18 there when you look at it, I mean, there really isn't. I
19 mean, you've got your industrial park back in there and, other
20 than that, down on Girdled Road you've got a little land.
21 But --

22 MS. FREEMAN: Right. Some of that stuff on Girdled,
23 I mean, is Auburn Career Center.

24 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Yeah, I know.

25 MS. FREEMAN: Some of that's privately owned. Yeah,
26 I mean, some of the stuff in the industrial park is already
27 developed, so it's highly unlikely, but there is still some
28 significant amount of vacant land in that district, you know.
29 And there is a trade-off, too, so you have to take that into
30 consideration. When the skilled nursing facility came in,

1 that was zoned industrial but we approved the rezone for that
2 new use, which is still a commercial use but it also has like
3 a residential component to it as well, same thing with the
4 assisted living. I mean, that went from a manufacturing
5 district, I believe -- I am sorry. It might have been Gateway
6 Business but it went from a commercial district to a district
7 that allowed a use that is still a commercial and business
8 type development but there are people living there.

9 MR. SCHINDLER: We always thought we'd have
10 industrial areas of the township to support the tax base but
11 that's, you know, the way the township has been developing
12 over the years. We're going farther and farther away from
13 that. People, they're coming out here to get away from
14 industry, for one thing, and they would prefer to come out
15 here and live, you know, like more residential and breathing
16 space.

17 I think it's time to show me. I think we probably
18 would be more apt to go away from that thinking than look at,
19 okay, our community is developing this way where people want
20 to come to live and raise a family.

21 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: But then you take away the, you
22 take away the tax base and JEDD money, things like that.

23 MR. SCHINDLER: Well, yeah, but what are we trying
24 to achieve? What's the township trying to achieve?

25 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Well, it's kind of balance, I
26 think.

27 MR. SCHINDLER: But that would be ideal because
28 we're talking about the township center where, here again,
29 senior citizens would, like, be able to be around, not only us
30 but even the young people today. Like I say, look at downtown

1 Cleveland. They can't build them fast enough because that's
2 where the younger generation wants to be, too, where the hub
3 of things are happening. So we would be able to service two
4 things, not only make it desirable for senior living but also
5 for the younger generation, too, because they always want to
6 be there where the action is.

7 And we're ideally located, especially because of the
8 freeways. If they want to go into town, bingo, they can go to
9 Cleveland, to the Playhouse Square and come back, you know, or
10 they can go into shopping real quickly, to Great Lakes Mall
11 and come back. They're not that far.

12 MS. FREEMAN: Right.

13 MR. SCHINDLER: Now we have, in the township, we
14 have there medical that could support the people, not only the
15 younger generation -- they get sick just as well as the
16 elderly do -- but we have it there that's close to take care
17 of that facet. I mean, we have so many things we can do. The
18 thing of it is we are chopped up a lot in the township. As
19 you can see, we're chopped up terribly. Where we could zone
20 something for like senior living, that's going to be very
21 difficult in the future. I think we just have to have
22 flexibility within the zoning to allow it to take place
23 wherever it can be put in. If a developer comes in, sees he
24 can put something like that in there, he'll do it. He'll do
25 it. And that's, I think, where we have to try to target our
26 zoning to accomplish.

27 MS. FREEMAN: I agree with that but I also somewhat
28 disagree. I think that the township does probably need to go
29 through the exercise of, you know, if we are going to develop
30 this district or whatever it might be, that we should have a

1 general idea of where it might be acceptable within the
2 township because then, otherwise, it is going to come up, you
3 know, where you haven't really planned for it. So I don't
4 know.

5 MR. SCHINDLER: Well, point well taken.

6 MS. FREEMAN: Yeah.

7 MR. SCHINDLER: Point well taken.

8 MS. FREEMAN: That's just my opinion.

9 MR. SCHINDLER: Well, that -- No, point well taken.
10 I agree with you. That's why we have to go back through, my
11 thinking, we have to focus on the Town Center.

12 MS. GERMOVSEK: Right, I agree, back to the Town
13 Center.

14 MR. SCHINDLER: Back to the Town Center.

15 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: But then again, look at the land
16 that's available. It's limited.

17 MR. SCHINDLER: It is limited because right now we
18 still got that big area, for example, that's still considered
19 industry and that might --

20 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: How would you approach that? We
21 can't just go in there and rezone somebody's property like
22 that.

23 MR. SCHINDLER: No.

24 MS. FREEMAN: No, no, no. I think, if we were to do
25 anything, it would be an option that someone could exercise on
26 their own.

27 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Right, right.

28 MR. SCHINDLER: Exactly.

29 MS. FREEMAN: Yeah, we wouldn't --

30 MR. SCHINDLER: No, I wouldn't want to do that.

1 MS. FREEMAN: No. I think if we were to do
2 anything, I would recommend that it -- we set it up as a
3 planned unit development where we don't really identify a
4 particular parcel.

5 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Yeah.

6 MR. SCHINDLER: Sure.

7 MS. FREEMAN: But, you know, we can have on record
8 our thoughts --

9 MR. SCHINDLER: Exactly.

10 MS. FREEMAN: -- of the township as far as what
11 might be suitable and what might not be.

12 MR. SCHINDLER: Right.

13 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Yeah, because Quail Hollow is a
14 really nice kind of a microcosm of Concord because you've got
15 big houses, medium houses, condos. You've got a pretty good
16 blend in there and you've got retail right next to it, I mean,
17 as far as we go on Crile Road. So that block there is really
18 a nice layout. It's a nice mixture.

19 MR. SCHINDLER: Sure.

20 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: If you could just expand that.

21 MR. SCHINDLER: Sure.

22 MS. FREEMAN: It also changed Concord Township
23 forever.

24 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: It did. It did.

25 MS. FREEMAN: We're still, you know --

26 MR. SCHINDLER: We are going to have Quail Hollow
27 II. Instead of putting a big golf course in there, we have
28 mini golf for the seniors, right?

29 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: So where do we want to go with
30 that, Heather?

1 MS. FREEMAN: I do not know.

2 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Continue it, the discussion next
3 meeting or -- I mean, I don't think we've resolved it but we
4 all know there is something that needs to be done there but
5 what it is, not sure.

6 MS. FREEMAN: Are you open to hearing from people
7 that are interested in building independent living about, you
8 know, or reaching out to anyone? Do you guys want to hear
9 from the development community at this point? Andy, you are
10 shaking your head no. I don't know. I am looking for your
11 direction, I guess, or your thoughts.

12 MR. SCHINDLER: Andy has been quiet.

13 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Come on, Andy.

14 MS. GERMOVSEK: Maybe we need to go to R-5.

15 MR. SCHINDLER: I don't know if that's good or bad.

16 MR. LINGENFELTER: I am just listening. I think the
17 big challenge is just, you know, the way that the township is
18 laid out. I mean, we talk about a lot of really nice concepts
19 but when it comes down, when the rubber meets the road, I
20 think there is -- it's a real difficult task because the
21 amenities and the closeness to services and things like that
22 become a challenge.

23 And then when you look at some of these larger lots
24 that are developable for these types of projects, they're
25 nestled right in the midst of other subdivisions, for the most
26 part. And I think you'd probably get a lot of pushback, you
27 know, from a density standpoint of where a lot of these lots,
28 a lot of these larger parcels are located because I think it
29 should be, I think -- I don't know that I am in favor of
30 creating another senior residential community or senior

1 housing. I don't know that I'm in favor of that.

2 MS. FREEMAN: Okay.

3 MR. LINGENFELTER: But I think, I think that whether
4 it's an overlay or whether it's something that we could bolt
5 onto an existing zoning designation and kind of take some of
6 the stuff that we like out of the senior residential zoning
7 text that we've eliminated, maybe go through that and kind of
8 cherry pick some things we like and maybe pull that in.

9 To me, it's very difficult because, you know, when
10 you start to put lot -- when you put projects, you know,
11 acreage for project size requirements, not a whole lot out
12 there to fit big lot developments like that, you know. And
13 then you combine that with the locations, you're kind of
14 defeating the purpose and you're plunking these high density
15 senior style living in the midst of, you know, of existing
16 subdivisions. I don't think it's compatible.

17 MS. FREEMAN: Right. Yeah, I would agree that.

18 MR. LINGENFELTER: You know, I don't know that it's
19 compatible. That's the problem.

20 MS. FREEMAN: So with the R-5, I mean, would you
21 agree that we've got our assisted living, we have our nursing
22 homes. Like, I don't know that we're trying to encourage more
23 of that or if there is a demand at all in the township for
24 that. I feel like the missing piece of what was originally
25 intended is the single detached or attached age-restricted
26 homes. I mean --

27 MR. LINGENFELTER: Right. But, see, the thing, the
28 funny thing is, you know, there is an opinion that people are
29 looking to get away from the larger homes and downsizing but
30 yet we're getting projects that are put in front of us that

1 are --

2 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Just the opposite.

3 MR. LINGENFELTER: -- exactly the opposite of what
4 -- I think the market kind of drives where that goes. I think
5 it would be, I think it would be foolish to try to steer or
6 drive the desire for certain types of developments, you know,
7 because I think the market is going to drive whether or not,
8 you know, there is a desire for that. I think if somebody has
9 an interest in that or if there was a bigger interest in that,
10 we would be seeing more projects in front of us that would
11 include those types of options and we're not. We're seeing
12 the traditional half acre, you know, 2,500, 3,500 square foot,
13 two-story home type projects, you know. So --

14 MS. FREEMAN: We have had, you know, staff and
15 administration have had previous conversations with, you know,
16 local developers and builders over the last several years
17 about specifically the R-3 and, you know, they wanted us to
18 entertain the idea of changing the way the R-3 is written to
19 allow them to do public streets with actual lots, you know,
20 fee simple lots they could sell off rather than do condominium
21 type ownership the way it's set up currently.

22 So there was some -- Some of the market was asking
23 for that. We weren't willing to, you know, change and amend
24 the code at that time. Even then, even right now, we still,
25 you know, the gentleman that wanted to do the independent
26 living on Prouty still has a market study that shows that
27 there is a demand for it here and he was hoping that, you
28 know, the township would take the time to go through a process
29 to either say yes or no, we like this or we don't want this
30 anywhere.

1 So I think there is some market demand for that.
2 There is someone that still wants to do that in Concord. They
3 were taking a step back to wait and see, you know, whether or
4 not we were going to go through and kind of, you know, have
5 discussion. Based on input that we heard from the Planning
6 Commission, you guys had all said maybe it's something we
7 should look at. So I don't know if that interest is going to
8 still be there, you know, once we get through whatever we're
9 going to get through but --

10 So I guess that was one of the, you know, not only
11 the recommendations from the Comp Plan but from the Planning
12 Commission where we had the application. And then just
13 knowing what was proposed within the township and we had the
14 R-3 that could have been the tool to provide that, and the
15 opposition was mainly that we didn't really know that we were
16 going to get what they said they were going to get. I don't
17 remember any discussion about, do we really need it. It is
18 more the other typical concern when it comes with development,
19 the increased traffic and soil, water and safety and that kind
20 of stuff, so basically told them that was not the appropriate
21 location.

22 MR. LINGENFELTER: I mean, you can pretty much
23 eliminate everything on the east side of the -- The eastern
24 part of the township, you can pretty much cut that off.

25 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Yeah.

26 MR. LINGENFELTER: It's got to be something that's
27 going to be, you know, have services available, water and
28 sewer. But I think maybe we reduced the, maybe reduced the
29 number of acres required for the project to encourage it
30 because, if you have too many acres, then there is not a whole

1 lot of options. So --

2 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Ten could be good. Ten could be
3 a good number.

4 MR. LINGENFELTER: Right.

5 MS. FREEMAN: We can set it up, you know, as an
6 overlay district. You could limit the proximity, which this
7 one -- Did this one limit the proximity between?

8 MR. LINGENFELTER: The thing, the only thing I would
9 want to do is I would want to make sure that, if we build this
10 into another zoning designation, that we're not in that, once
11 it's rezoned to a specific zoning designation, that the
12 options for what could end up in there --

13 MS. FREEMAN: Are multiple.

14 MR. LINGENFELTER: -- are multiple. I would want it
15 to be a, you know, if we're going to rezone it to this, it is
16 going to be used as this and that's --

17 MS. FREEMAN: That, with the overlay planned unit
18 development, that's your way you get it.

19 MR. LINGENFELTER: Right. See, that's where I
20 think, you know, if you decide that you're not going to do
21 this project or economics change --

22 MS. FREEMAN: Right.

23 MR. LINGENFELTER: -- and all of the sudden that
24 project is no longer feasible, then it goes back to what the
25 previous -- You know what I am saying? I don't want to give
26 anybody an out. I don't want to rezone a piece of property
27 with an intent and then have that intent not be met. That
28 would be something I would want to try to do as much as
29 within, what's within our capability.

30 MS. FREEMAN: Well, maybe what I should do is go

1 back and look at what we may want to, you know, may want to
2 try to salvage from the R-5 and see how we could frame it up
3 as a possible overlay district. And I can take some time and
4 look at, you know, these areas on the map a little bit more
5 closely and come back with some maybe clearer information to
6 give you guys so you can have --

7 MR. LINGENFELTER: I would like to see, I would like
8 to see an option. Give the builders, you know, give the
9 builders an option so that they have some options, just like
10 the RCD is an option. It's not a requirement, it's an option.
11 And if you set it up to where there is enough incentive, you
12 know, to do that option then I think it would be something
13 that could potentially drive, you know, drive the developers
14 to favor that because they're going to do what's going to be
15 best for their market and for what's going to -- I mean,
16 that's the bottom line, right? We're not going to dictate
17 what has to go where but I think, if we give them options that
18 will incent them to consider those types of developments, then
19 I think that would be a good idea.

20 MS. FREEMAN: The other thing we can maybe look at
21 is the existing R-3 and determine if there is maybe some
22 modification that we need to make to that to make it more
23 palatable with the township, you know, in the future if we get
24 another application for that. Maybe we can change the way
25 that code is written.

26 Just off the top of my head, I don't know if we can
27 do this but could we make the three to eight units a
28 conditional use versus a permitted which then -- and maybe
29 we're not allowed to do that. I am not sure. But maybe there
30 is a way to allow them to do fee simple. I don't know. So

1 there is some other things we can look at that might help
2 encourage and give, provide lower maintenance, you know,
3 smaller homes within the confines of the code that we kind of
4 already have without drastically changing it. I think we're
5 looking at two different things, well, three, actually, if you
6 throw in the RCD. The RCD, what we can salvage from the R-5,
7 and do we need to change --

8 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Anything we did would probably,
9 I mean, it would almost have to be higher density to make it
10 worth their while because you've got smaller units but we're
11 not talking about a huge development but a 10 acre section on
12 one of these yellow blocks here, allow a little more, higher
13 density, get that kind of housing, that might work, you know.

14 MS. FREEMAN: And maybe real amenities for the
15 residents, you know.

16 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Yeah, real amenities.

17 MS. FREEMAN: Require sidewalks --

18 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Right.

19 MS. FREEMAN: -- and a community area and where they
20 can actually feel like a community within their own little
21 district.

22 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Like a little village within a
23 village, yeah, okay.

24 MR. SCHINDLER: Yeah, I like the idea of having a
25 retirement like R-5 but massage it and take some of the
26 restrictions out, like you said, massage it and then have,
27 like Andy says, an overlay and say, "Look, guys, we have this
28 land. We can put this here but you have the flexibility to
29 put -- see how many you can get in there," but still achieving
30 the cost and stuff for seniors.

1 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Right, right.

2 MR. SCHINDLER: And even for the younger generation.

3 MS. GERMOVSEK: Yeah, I was going to say maybe we
4 don't want to make it for seniors, you know, just keep it
5 open.

6 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: It could be, yeah, a mixed
7 community.

8 MR. SCHINDLER: Okay. We could say, right, if the
9 seniors part scares everybody then, okay, then eventually, if
10 that's the case, take that naturally anyway.

11 MS. GERMOVSEK: Like you say, the market will drive
12 that.

13 MR. SCHINDLER: Yeah, like Andy says, the market
14 will drive it.

15 MS. GERMOVSEK: If the younger family wants to come
16 in --

17 MR. SCHINDLER: If the youngers say, "Oh, look, we
18 can get a little place" --

19 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Yeah, I wouldn't restrict it.

20 MR. SCHINDLER: I wouldn't restrict it, that would
21 be good.

22 MS. FREEMAN: I would probably be cautious with that
23 just because we are, for all other developments, you know, we
24 really want to use that RCD option in limited circumstances,
25 you know. We're amenable to more R-3 but I think, if we were
26 to create some overlay where it was basically just higher
27 density and allow them to do almost anything, that I don't
28 know how that would affect the other tools that we already
29 have in place and how that might shift how development
30 happens. Maybe they stay away from the RCD because, oh, we

1 can do this option.

2 MR. SCHINDLER: So you think we should keep it as --

3 MS. GERMOVSEK: I say we --

4 MS. FREEMAN: I think, if we are going to do an
5 overlay, we would probably want to restrict it for the
6 independent living.

7 MR. SCHINDLER: Designate it for that, okay. That
8 makes --

9 MS. FREEMAN: That's just my initial kind of --

10 MR. SCHINDLER: No, it makes a good point but, there
11 again, like Richard says, the market will -- and Andy -- the
12 market will dictate.

13 MS. FREEMAN: Whether or not anyone exercises
14 that --

15 MR. SCHINDLER: That's right. And like I say, the
16 times are changing. The market will change. The developers
17 are going to realize, hey, you know, can't build these big
18 things, here again, going back to cost of bigger homes and
19 energy and cost, stuff that's really hitting us hard, the
20 people, even the younger generation. So this would help be
21 able to take care of that and will be able to achieve still
22 what we're trying to do.

23 MS. GERMOVSEK: So that Town Center area, that is
24 all just off the table, I mean?

25 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: As a --

26 MS. GERMOVSEK: As a mix used?

27 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: No. The Town Center, is that
28 dead or where is that?

29 MS. FREEMAN: There is no movement on that now. I
30 mean, we do have the Capital District zoning in place on about

1 70 acres.

2 MS. GERMOVSEK: How many acres?

3 MS. FREEMAN: I think it's roughly 70 acres that we
4 rezoned Capital. Within that option it is, like, the Planned
5 Unit Development option.

6 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: That's what we own.

7 MS. FREEMAN: We're not actively promoting that.
8 The township and the JEDD doesn't have any active MOUs or
9 anything with the property owners. So they're not doing any
10 kind of promotion of any kind beyond the seven acre parcel
11 that the township owns.

12 MR. LINGENFELTER: So there is no RFP out or --

13 MS. FREEMAN: No.

14 MR. LINGENFELTER: Is that something that's going to
15 come back at some point?

16 MS. FREEMAN: I think that's all going to be market
17 driven at this point, you know, I think. I know the JEDD is
18 going through a little bit of a transition with a couple new
19 board members and they're trying to redefine their focus on
20 how they're going to strategize. I think they've been talking
21 about shifting their focus on bringing in more the industrial
22 complex and trying to make the industrial park back there a
23 little bit more attractive, what can we do to help facilitate
24 that, whereas, previously they were a little bit more focused
25 on the retail, the hotels, like, those type of uses, so --
26 which they've been coming without people asking them to come,
27 if you see.

28 MS. FREEMAN: I just like the whole amphitheater and
29 that whole --

30 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Yeah, it's kind of neat.

1 MS. GERMOVSEK: -- outdoor walkability.

2 MS. FREEMAN: There's a lot of speculation out there
3 now. There is people looking at commercial. Talked to
4 different sellers and potential buyers about various ideas and
5 it seems like we may pick up in the next year or two more
6 commercial land, you know. Residential is continuing.

7 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Okay. So you're going to bring
8 something next time.

9 MS. FREEMAN: I will bring some stuff. I don't know
10 exactly. Yeah, I'll bring some work and maybe I will feed you
11 information in between.

12 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Okay, very good.

13 MS. FREEMAN: See how it goes.

14 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Okay.

15 MS. FREEMAN: Other than that, I think for next
16 month, we will have another site plan review application.
17 It's another lot that is part of Grist Mill, the site between
18 Waffle House and Key Bank, so another new commercial building.

19 MR. LINGENFELTER: Oh, all right.

20 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: All right. Thank you.

21 Okay. Item 4 on our agenda then, you all have in
22 your packet the minutes from the February 4, 2020, meeting.
23 Do I have a motion to approve those as written?

24 MR. SCHINDLER: Mr. Chairman, I so move that we
25 approve the minutes as written.

26 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Okay. Do I have a second?

27 MS. GERMOVSEK: I will second that motion.

28 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Okay. I have a motion and
29 second. All in favor say "aye."

30 (Four aye votes, no nay votes.)

1 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Okay. Minutes are approved.
2 Correspondence report for Zoning Commission members.
3 I will start with Sue. Anything?

4 MS. GERMOVSEK: Nothing.

5 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Okay. Andy?

6 MR. LINGENFELTER: No.

7 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Frank?

8 MR. SCHINDLER: No, sir.

9 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: And I had nothing either.

10 Okay. Item 6 then, Audience Participation, Vanessa,
11 did you still wish to participate?

12 MS. PESEC: Thanks. Vanessa Pesec, 11705 Cali
13 Court. Just as you're thinking about all of the, the
14 potential rezoning, realizing that, if you are considering R-3
15 or multi-family or something like that, realizing that the
16 criteria is transitional use, land between lower density
17 family residence and non-residential areas; major highways,
18 adjacent to major highways such as 90; and, the word "and,"
19 like all three, constrained sites, locations that are
20 currently zoned for single family where low-density
21 residential is not likely to develop. So, again, realizing
22 that a lot of those yellow marked areas are not, you know,
23 amenable to R-3 or higher density.

24 And then also I just put together a little chart.
25 Would you mind passing these out to everybody? I'm sorry.

26 MR. LINGENFELTER: Are you referencing the 2004
27 Comprehensive Plan?

28 MS. PESEC: That was 2004 and it was also in the
29 2015.

30 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: The original plan is 16 years

1 old though.

2 MS. PESEC: Yeah, that's what -- Heather spent a lot
3 of time talking about that plan and referencing it. But it's
4 also in the purpose statement for R-3. So in your -- Yes,
5 absolutely. It's also in your purpose statement in R-3 in
6 your current zoning text, those three statements.

7 What I did was I looked, took a step back and said,
8 we're thinking about senior housing and that sort of thing.
9 So what is the current age breakout that we have in Concord, 0
10 to 18, 19 to 24, 25-34, 35-54, 55-64, and 65 and over? I took
11 the population that Dave Radachy gave to me from the Planning
12 Commission -- 2017 or 2018, I think, was the latest number
13 that he had -- and then broke it out as a percentage. So we
14 have 21 percent 0 to -- 21.5 percent 0 to 18, and the large
15 number that we're talking about in terms of seniors are 20.5
16 percent 65 and older and 18.5 percent 55 to 64.

17 And I asked David what would be an ideal kind of
18 look for this age grouping. And he said, if you had the same
19 number, the same percentage across, that's an ideal, you know,
20 kind of age graph that you want. You want young, middle-aged,
21 older, that would be great. We tend to be very heavy in
22 Concord on the older side. I am part of that older age group,
23 so I am talking about myself.

24 And you can see that the next numbers are of the
25 Ohio percentage from the Kaiser Family Foundation that I just
26 looked online. There are probably other numbers and slightly
27 other groupings as well. But, again, we tend to be older even
28 than the general numbers in Ohio.

29 And then I looked at the U.S. Census. I don't know
30 what year that might have been. 2010 is the latest that they

1 officially have.

2 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: 2010.

3 MS. PESEC: There are some estimates every year that
4 go up but that might be -- And, that, Lake County is 20
5 percent. So we're even above Lake County in terms of 65 and
6 older in that.

7 So my question is, and what you were talking about
8 is, should we be spending a lot of time thinking about
9 attracting additional senior citizens or, as you were talking
10 about, does it end up being lots that anybody can move into,
11 you know, because it looks as though our millennial numbers
12 are pretty low. The, you know, 19 to 24 were only at 6 and 25
13 to 34 were only at 7 percent.

14 MR. LINGENFELTER: Well, this isn't a community for
15 people that age to live in anyway. I don't know too many
16 24-year-olds that can afford to buy a house in Concord
17 Township.

18 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Yeah.

19 MS. PESEC: Right. Well, that was the thing with
20 the Town Center as it is when it was being proposed. It
21 didn't make sense because what millennial is going to come out
22 here, A, first of all? B, there is no walk to work unless you
23 worked at Lake Hospital and to take your life in your hands
24 walking down Auburn. Third, what millennial is going to be
25 able to afford what they said was going to be \$300,000
26 townhouses? So --

27 MR. LINGENFELTER: I don't think we're trying to --
28 I don't think we're trying to attract more seniors.

29 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: No. I think we're trying to
30 retain them.

1 MR. LINGENFELTER: I think what we're trying to do
2 is trying to accommodate the seniors that are already here --

3 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Retain who we have.

4 MR. LINGENFELTER: -- okay, with other alternative
5 housing.

6 MS. PESEC: Right. So the question --

7 MR. LINGENFELTER: We're not trying to put something
8 in that's going to bring senior citizens into the community.

9 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Right.

10 MR. LINGENFELTER: I think we've already got a lot
11 of senior citizens --

12 MS. PESEC: Right.

13 MR. LINGENFELTER: -- in the community. I think
14 what we're trying to do is the vast, a lot, a big percentage
15 of these senior citizens are in larger homes, okay, that are
16 looking for alternatives. So I would think that what I
17 foresee with this kind of a task is not to attract a
18 particular demographic to Concord, it is to accommodate the
19 demographic that we already have established. That's what I
20 think we've got to focus on.

21 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: I totally agree because you've
22 got, by your numbers, you've got 45 percent that are in the
23 roughly 50 to 65 age bracket. I don't think we want those
24 people to leave the township and I don't think they want to
25 leave the township but they would like to have alternative
26 housing that's not what they have had when they were 30 and
27 40.

28 And I've always said all along when we talked about
29 this, retain the people we have, give them an option to stay
30 in the township as opposed to moving to Mentor, let's say, or

1 something like that because those people support our
2 businesses that are here and are part of the community and
3 want to say in the community.

4 MS. PESEC: Right. So the smaller, the smaller
5 single detached kind of unit.

6 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Yeah, right.

7 MS. PESEC: So then, if that's the concept, then
8 your analysis should be all the people that moved into the
9 Quail Hollow single attached and people that are going to
10 Hygrove or all of those places that are -- Do an analysis and
11 find out, are they moving from Concord big homes to small
12 homes or are they moving from Mentor and Euclid and all the
13 rest? Because that's, you know -- Your concept is exactly
14 right. I might like to downsize. You might like to downsize.
15 You are going to have a problem with your garages but, you
16 know, and that's great but you don't zone for that. You zone
17 for the home and you have to decide who is moving.

18 So is it true that that's happening or is it true
19 that more people, you know -- I mean, I have a lot of friends
20 that are in Quail. They didn't -- They weren't in Concord.
21 They moved from other cities. So I just pose that as you guys
22 were all going back and forth and making thoughts and
23 discussions. Those are some additional points.

24 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Okay.

25 MS. PESEC: And then, additionally, I wanted to also
26 point out in the second half of this sheet -- Oh, Heather, I
27 spelled your name wrong. I am very sorry. Heather's
28 presentation, one of the sheets talked about the different
29 types of homes. And when you add the 404 that she had given
30 you for single detached condos, plus all of these other

1 numbers of one-unit attached, two and four, five plus units
2 detached, 23 percent of Concord's housing stock are in condos
3 or attached units of some type.

4 So, again, as you're starting to think of the kinds
5 of housing that you want to put up, realize that we have a
6 tremendous amount of stock for different types of people. If
7 somebody wants to downsize, they don't want to deal with the
8 yard, they don't want to deal with anything, they can move
9 into single detached, they can move into one-unit attached,
10 you know. We have 958. So we have a large number of ways
11 that people currently can be there. Twenty-three percent is a
12 lot.

13 MR. LINGENFELTER: Based on what?

14 MS. PESEC: Based on the other county -- places in
15 Lake County. I didn't put together that chart.

16 MR. LINGENFELTER: I would be interested. When you
17 say that's a lot, you say 23 percent is a lot, what is it in
18 comparison to, Mentor?

19 MS. PESEC: I don't have the numbers in front of me.

20 MR. LINGENFELTER: See, I would want to know that.

21 MS. PESEC: Absolutely, but that's your job. What I
22 am doing is helping y'all along.

23 MR. LINGENFELTER: When you are saying it's a lot,
24 I mean, you're making a statement, right?

25 MS. PESEC: Yeah. When you look at the --

26 MR. LINGENFELTER: You are saying we have a lot
27 of -- Your position is we have a lot of condo and multi, you
28 know, multi-unit dwelling in the township. You are saying 23
29 percent is a lot but you don't have anything to base that
30 opinion on other than just it's a statement. You are saying

1 it's a lot.

2 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: And knowing --

3 MS. PESEC: So, yes --

4 MR. LINGENFELTER: Is it a lot? I mean, to me, 23
5 percent seems -- that's less than 25 percent. That's less
6 than a quarter.

7 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: And knowing these condos, a lot
8 of them are up and down, these condos. They're two floor.

9 MS. PESEC: Were you on the 2004 Comprehensive Plan?

10 MR. LINGENFELTER: Yes.

11 MS. PESEC: Good. So you saw the chart where
12 Concord was rather high in the amount of housing. So we have
13 a pretty high percentage for Lake County in terms of this one-
14 unit detached condo, plus one-unit detached and multi homes.
15 So you saw that chart and you do know that Concord has a
16 relatively high number but I don't have the exact number.

17 MR. LINGENFELTER: Right.

18 MS. PESEC: But you do know that.

19 MR. LINGENFELTER: Right.

20 MS. PESEC: Good, thanks.

21 Rich, I am sorry. You were saying something.

22 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: I was just going to say a lot of
23 these condos, I know of these units and a lot of them are two
24 story. So they're condos but they're not ideal what maybe a
25 person downsizing would want to get into. Frank talked about
26 wanting to get into one floor. Not all that -- I would say
27 maybe a third of them are one floor, the rest are all multi
28 story. So they're condos but they're multi story and they
29 probably tend to attract younger buyers because of that,
30 because I just know most of these units that are here, with

1 the exception of Quail Hollow where some of them are
2 freestanding and a lot of them are ranches. But the rest --

3 MS. PESEC: Right.

4 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: The rest. And Auburn Ridge is
5 ranches and Aria's Way though, for example, they're all two
6 story.

7 MS. PESEC: Yeah. Eagles, Eagles Nest, the stuff on
8 here in Quail Hollow --

9 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Yeah, I know which one you mean.

10 MS. PESEC: Port Royal.

11 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Yeah.

12 MS. PESEC: These are single.

13 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: There are some there, yeah.

14 MS. PESEC: Yeah. So there's a fair number that are
15 single. I am very aware of when things are one story and two,
16 really aware. And that's why I was so frustrated when you put
17 the overlay district for Capital Parkway and you made it a
18 requirement that all of the housing had to be townhomes and it
19 must all be two story. So nobody who is elderly or has a
20 physical disability could currently move into that.

21 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: We didn't make that a
22 requirement. That was just a concept. That was never
23 approved or anything. It was --

24 MS. PESEC: No, but in the zoning text as it stands
25 right now --

26 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: I don't think we said. Did we
27 say it had to be two story?

28 MS. PESEC: Yes.

29 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: I don't recall that.

30 MS. PESEC: Yes, yes. I am telling you, yeah.

1 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: I didn't think we did.

2 MS. PESEC: Yeah, townhomes that are required to be
3 two story because I even offered a recommendation where it
4 would look like they were townhomes but you would own like two
5 halves and then somebody would be on the second floor. So the
6 first floor could be, you know, barrier free entry and it
7 could look like, you know -- I could live there. And then you
8 could have the walk-up as a second floor but, from the
9 outside, it would look like a townhome. But that didn't fly.

10 So, hopefully, we will, in the future, be able to
11 remedy that so that, if somebody rezoned for Town Center, you
12 would be able to downsize in those areas.

13 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: I like that idea.

14 MS. PESEC: So those are just some additional
15 thoughts looking at populations and looking at total units and
16 then looking at where multi-family actually fits in. And the
17 purpose statements of R-3, where in the Concord does it fit
18 in? And it needs to fit in in those certain areas that are
19 transitional areas, like you said, just not in the middle of,
20 you know, east of Ravenna where it's easily all R-4 and it's
21 all, you know, residential areas. So those are my comments
22 thanks.

23 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Okay, very good.

24 MS. PESEC: Thanks.

25 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: Thank you.

26 Any other discussion for tonight? We're good?

27 MR. LINGENFELTER: I am discussed out.

28 CHAIRMAN PETERSON: With Andy's situation and mine,
29 I will adjourn the meeting and our next meeting will be
30 April 7th. And I will be gone, so that's yours, Sue.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

MS. FREEMAN: Hiram will be back.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 8:59 p.m.)

1 STATE OF OHIO)
2 COUNTY OF CUYAHOGA)

CERTIFICATE

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

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

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

17 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
18 and affixed my seal of office this 27th day of March 2020.

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

Melinda A. Melton

Melinda A. Melton
Registered Professional Reporter

Notary Public within and for the
State of Ohio

My Commission Expires:
February 4, 2023

