Meeting Agenda

A. Call to Order
Chair Mavrides

B. Roll Call
Smith

C. Approval of the January 23, 2020 SCPC Minutes
Chair Mavrides

D. Business Items
Knittel

New Business

Item #1 – Retreat at Liberty Lakes – Revised Preliminary Plan – Twinsburg Township — Located in Twinsburg Township off of Liberty Rd at the county line with Cuyahoga County, just north of the Willowbrook Subdivision.

a) The applicant is requesting a variance from the subdivision regulations 1105.04(a) Blocks, the regulations have a 1,500’ block length maximum, a 1,714.8’ long block is proposed meaning a 214.8’ variance is needed.

b) The applicant is requesting a variance from the subdivision regulations 1108.07(f) Street Intersections. The subdivision regulations require a 100’ tangent, a 73.6’ tangent is proposed needing a 26.4’ variance.

c) The proposal is 60 lots on 39.0760 Acres with 23.0544 Acres of Open Space, Sewage serviced by DSSS and Twin-Keystone Water.

Item #2 – Richfield Township – Zoning Text Amendment - Richfield Township Zoning Commission is proposing an amendment of Article IV, Section 420-2 Use Regulations for the LI-O Light Industrial-Office District to remove text about special conditions for warehouse uses and distribution center uses.

E. Report from Assistant Director
Tubbs

F. Comments from Public
Chair Mavrides

G. Comments from Commission Members
Chair Mavrides

H. Other
Nott

1. Legal Update

I. Adjournment
Chair Mavrides
Minutes of January Meeting

Members Present: George Beckham, Helen Humphrys, David Kline, Allen Mavrides, Jason Segedy, Jeff Snell, and Dennis Stoiber

Members Absent: Becky Corbett, Jerry Feeman, Robert Terry, and Jeff Wilhite

Staff: Dennis Tubbs, Stephen Knittel, and Cazz Smith Jr.

Others: Joe Paradise – SCE,

I. Call to Order

Allen Mavrides called the meeting to order on Thursday, January 23, 2020 at 3:00 pm in the County of Summit Council Chambers, 175 South Main Street, 7th Floor, Akron Ohio 44308. A roll call was conducted by Cazz Smith the attending members constituted a quorum.

II. Approval of the December 19, 2019 Meeting Minutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCPC Member</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Motion</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Yea</th>
<th>Nay</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beckham, George</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corbett, Becky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeman, Jerry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrys, Helen</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kline, David</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mavrides, Allen</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segedy, Jason</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snell, Jeff</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoiber, Dennis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry, Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilhite, Jeff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Motion
Helen Humphrys made a motion to approve the minutes of the December 19, 2019 Meeting meeting, and it was seconded by Dennis Stoiber the motion passed with no abstentions.

III. Election of Officers
1. Chair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCPC Member</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Motion</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Yea</th>
<th>Nay</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beckham, George</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corbett, Becky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeman, Jerry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrys, Helen</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kline, David</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mavrides, Allen</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segedy, Jason</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snell, Jeff</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoiber, Dennis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry, Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilhite, Jeff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Motion

David Kline made a motion to nominate Allen Mavrides as SCPC Chair 2020, and it was seconded by Dennis Stoiber the motion passed with one abstention.

2. Vice Chair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCPC Member</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Motion</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Yea</th>
<th>Nay</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beckham, George</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corbett, Becky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeman, Jerry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrys, Helen</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kline, David</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mavrides, Allen</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segedy, Jason</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snell, Jeff</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoiber, Dennis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry, Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilhite, Jeff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Motion

Helen Humphrys made a motion to nominate Dennis Stoiber as SCPC Vice Chair 2020, and it was seconded by George Beckham the motion passed with one abstention.

Election of Officers (cont.)
3. Secretary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCPC Member</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Motion</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Yea</th>
<th>Nay</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beckham, George</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corbett, Becky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeman, Jerry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrys, Helen</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kline, David</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mavrides, Allen</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segedy, Jason</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snell, Jeff</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoiber, Dennis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry, Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilhite, Jeff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Motion_

_Helen Humphrys_ made a motion to nominate Jason Segedy as SCPC Secretary 2020, and it was seconded by _Jeff Snell_ the motion passed with one abstention.
IV. Business Items

A. New Business – (1) item

New Business

Item # 1 – Sagamore Hills Township – Zoning Text Amendment - Sagamore Hills Township – Zoning Commission is proposing an amendment of Section 14 Planned Unit Development Amendment to establish clarity about accessory buildings/structures within planned unit development districts.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends to the Summit County Planning Commission that the proposed text amendment be **APPROVED**.

SCPC Action: Approved with due consideration to comments from SCPC

Approval: **Approved**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCPC Member</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Motion</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Yea</th>
<th>Nay</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beckham, George</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corbett, Becky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeman, Jerry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrys, Helen</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kline, David</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mavrides, Allen</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segedy, Jason</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snell, Jeff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoiber, Dennis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry, Robert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilhite, Jeff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- SCPC recommends some text alteration for better clarity. Underlined text is new language, strikethroughs are words to be removed.
  - “A single-family home shall be permitted to have up to two (2) accessory buildings/structures not to exceed twelve (12) feet in height and an aggregate total of one hundred fifty (150) square feet. All accessory buildings/structures shall be in the rear yard, be a minimum of ten (10) feet from the side-yard lot lines, a minimum of ten (10) feet from the rear-yard lot line, and completely within the site line of the rear of the lot as defined by the front and rear corners of the widest section of the single-family home. (see attached drawings)

**Motion**

A request was made by the applicant to table Item # 1 – Sagamore Hills Township – Zoning
Text Amendment - Sagamore Hills Township a motion was made by Helen Humphrys to approve tabling this item, it was seconded by David Kline the motion passed with one abstention.

V. Report from Assistant Director

VI. Comments from Public

VII. Comments from Planning Commission Members

VIII. Other

IX. Next Meeting

The next Summit County Planning Commission meeting will be held on Thursday, February 27, 2020.

X. Adjournment

Being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, Helen Humphrys made a motion to adjourn, and it was seconded by Jason Segedy The motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 3:22 pm.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Located in Twinsburg Township off of Liberty Rd at the county line with Cuyahoga County, just north of the Willowbrook Subdivision.

a) The applicant is requesting a variance from the subdivision regulations 1105.04(a) Blocks, the regulations have a 1,500’ block length maximum, a 1,714.8’ long block is proposed meaning a 214.8’ variance is needed.

b) The applicant is requesting a variance from the subdivision regulations 1108.07(f) Street Intersections. The subdivision regulations require a 100’ tangent, a 73.6’ tangent is proposed needing a 26.4’ variance.

Staff recommends Approval.

c) The proposal is 60 lots on 39.0760 Acres with 23.0544 Acres of Open Space, Sewage serviced by DSSS and Twin-Keystone Water.

Staff recommends: Conditional Approval.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.:</th>
<th>1 a, b, &amp; c</th>
<th>Area:</th>
<th>39.0760 Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting:</td>
<td>February 27, 2020</td>
<td>Lots:</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer:</td>
<td>Brad Piroli, Pulte Group</td>
<td>Streets:</td>
<td>60’ R/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer:</td>
<td>Neff and Associates</td>
<td>Utilities:</td>
<td>DSSS &amp; Twin-Keystone Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel No.:</td>
<td>6201347</td>
<td>Council District:</td>
<td>1, Ron Koehler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning:</td>
<td>Residential R-2 with PRD</td>
<td>Processor:</td>
<td>Stephen Knittel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site History:

- There was a Concept Plan Meeting held on August 3, 2018
- There was a site visit on August 16, 2018
- The applicant submitted a request to FEMA for a CLOMR and received confirmation of the requests receipt on January 28, 2020

• There are two roadways proposed
  o Proposed Road A, with an ingress and egress onto Liberty Road that turns at the intersection with Proposed Road B and ends in a cul-de-sac
  o Proposed Road B, that runs from the terminus of Fenmore Lane and ends at the intersection with Proposed Road A.

• There are two water quality basin’s proposed.

**Site Conditions:** Wetlands have been identified on the fringes of the property. The FEMA Flood Rate Insurance Map shows the Lakes in the Flood Rate “A” Zone. This is defined as an area subject to inundation by a 1 percent chance flood.

**Township Zoning:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>R-1-E</td>
<td>Residential low density</td>
<td>City of Solon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>PDD</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Reminderville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>PDD</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Reminderville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>PUD</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>City of Twinsburg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1a. Variance Request:

The applicant is requesting a variance from the subdivision regulations 1105.04(a) Blocks, the regulations have a 1,500’ block length maximum, a 1,714.8’ long block is proposed meaning a 214.8’ variance is needed. The following narratives were submitted in response to the questions posed in the variance application. Staff comments are **bold and italicized.**

i. Are there exceptional topographic or other physical conditions peculiar to this particular parcel or land? If, so please explain.

Yes, existing ponds and existing roadway tie in location required a very specific intersection location.

*The location of lakes, wetlands, and existing roadway tie ins limit the potential locations of roadways combined with the existing length of the parcel potential blocks to connect the roadways are forced to be in excess of 1500 ft.*

ii. What is the unnecessary hardship which will result from a literal enforcement of the Subdivision Regulation owing to the special conditions set forth in subparagraph (i.) herein?

Yes, existing ponds and existing roadway tie in location required a very specific
intersection location.

The location of lakes, wetlands, and existing roadway tie ins limit the potential locations of roadways combined with the existing length of the parcel potential blocks to connect the roadways are forced to be in excess of 1500 ft.

iii. Did the special conditions specified in subparagraph (i.) result from previous actions by the applicant? Please explain.

No, existing roadway of adjacent property was designed and approved by others. Pond has existing on site prior to the 1950s.

No.

iv. Explain whether the variance requested is substantial.

Variance request is minor and very close to required minimums/maximums.

Subdivision Regulations have a 1,500' maximum block length the proposed block length is a 1,714.8' a 214.8' variance is needed.

v. Explain whether the essential character of the neighborhood would be substantially altered or whether adjoining properties would suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance.

Being such a minor variance request, granting the variance will have no impact to the character of the neighborhood, and adjoining properties would not suffer a substantial detriment.

The essential character of the neighborhood would not change with the granting of the variance nor would adjoining properties suffer substantial detriment.

vi. Will the variance adversely affect the delivery of governmental services, including but not limited to, access by firefighting apparatus, law enforcement vehicles, ambulance and emergency vehicles and similar services relative to ingress and egress to the affected site and adjacent land?

Granting the variance would actually improve access by allowing connection to adjacent subdivision

No, the addition of the proposed roadway could increase traffic connectivity and circulation.

vii. Explain whether the Subdivision Regulation was in effect at the time of acquisition of the property by the applicant and whether the applicant purchased the property with the knowledge of the Regulation.
Applicant has a purchase agreement on the property and has knowledge of the regulation. As mentioned above, the variance will improve access for governmental services, and is very close to required minimum/maximum.

Yes.

viii. Explain whether the applicant’s predicament can be feasibly solved through some method other than a variance.

As mentioned above, the existing roadway and pond locations result in a very specific intersection relationship and geometry.

*The applicant’s predicament cannot be feasibly solved through another method other than a variance due to the geography of the parcel and the existing roadways.*

ix. Explain how the variance from the Subdivision Regulations will not be contrary to the public interest.

As mentioned above, the variance would improve access by allowing connection to adjacent subdivision.

*This variance would not be contrary to public interest as the access and use would not pose a threat/concern to public safety or the character of the neighborhood.*

x. Explain how the spirit and intent behind the Subdivision Regulations will be observed if the variance is granted.

As mentioned above, the variance is very minimal and the design is very close to the spirit and intent behind the Subdivision Regulations.

*The spirit and intent of the following purposes and objectives of the Regulations as listed in § 1101.02 WOULD be observed if the Variances were granted:*

(a) The proper arrangement of streets or highways in relation to existing or proposed streets and highways and the thoroughfare plan.  
   *This variance would allow for the existing street network to connect.*

(b) Adequate and convenient open spaces for traffic, utilities, access for firefighting apparatus, recreation, light and air, and the avoidance of congestion of the population.  
   *This variance would not affect the above.*

(c) The orderly, efficient, and appropriate development of land.  
   *This would not affect the orderly, efficient and appropriate development of land.*

(d) The orderly and efficient provision of community facilities at minimum cost and maximum convenience.  
   *This would not impact the orderly and efficient provision of community facilities.*
(e) Safe and convenient vehicular and pedestrian movement.  
   This variance would allow for the existing street network to connect.

(f) The promotion of public health, safety, comfort, convenience, prosperity, and general welfare, and the protection of the environment.  
   This would not affect the promotion of public health, safety, comfort, convenience, prosperity, and general welfare, and the protection of the environment.

(g) The accurate surveying of land, preparing and recording of plats.  
   This would not impact the accurate surveying of land, preparing and recording of plats.

(h) The equitable handling of all subdivision plats by providing uniform procedures and standards for observance by both the approving authority and Developer as defined herein.  
   This variance is required for the current layout as approved by the Township.

xi. Explain how the requested variance is the minimum variance to the Subdivision Regulations that will allow for a reasonable division of land.

As mentioned above, the existing roadway and pond locations result in a very specific intersection relationship and geometry.

The location of lakes, wetlands, and existing roadway tie ins limit the potential locations of roadways combined with the existing length of the parcel potential blocks to connect the roadways are forced to be in excess of 1500 ft.

Staff Comments: Variances are to alleviate unnecessary hardships imposed by literal enforcement of the subdivision regulations due to exceptional topographic or other physical conditions peculiar to a parcel.

- The requested variance is the minimum variance required for the split to be performed.
- The location of lakes, wetlands, and existing roadway tie ins limit the potential locations of roadways combined with the existing length of the parcel potential blocks to connect the roadways are forced to be in excess of 1500 ft.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends the SCPC APPROVE the Variance Request.
1b Variance Request:

The applicant is requesting a variance from the subdivision regulations 1108.07(f) Street Intersections. The subdivision regulations require a 100’ tangent, an 73.6’ tangent is proposed needing an 26.4’ variance.

The following narratives were submitted in response to the questions posed in the variance application. Staff comments are **bold and italicized**.

xii. Are there exceptional topographic or other physical conditions peculiar to this particular parcel or land? If, so please explain.

Yes, existing ponds and existing roadway tie in location required a very specific intersection location.

*The location of lakes, wetlands, and existing roadway tie ins limit the potential locations of roadways.*

xiii. What is the unnecessary hardship which will result from a literal enforcement of the Subdivision Regulation owing to the special conditions set forth in subparagraph (i.) herein?

Yes, existing ponds and existing roadway tie in location required a very specific intersection location.

*The location of lakes, wetlands, and existing roadway tie ins limit the potential locations of roadways.*

xiv. Did the special conditions specified in subparagraph (i.) result from previous actions by the applicant? Please explain.

No, existing roadway of adjacent property was designed and approved by others. Pond has existing on site prior to the 1950s.

*No.*

xv. Explain whether the variance requested is substantial.

Variance request is minor and very close to required minimums/maximums.

*Subdivision Regulations require a 100’ tangent, a 73.6’ tangent is proposed needing a 26.4’ variance.*

xvi. Explain whether the essential character of the neighborhood would be substantially altered or whether adjoining properties would suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance.
Being such a minor variance request, granting the variance will have no impact to the character of the neighborhood, and adjoining properties would not suffer a substantial detriment.

*The essential character of the neighborhood would not change with the granting of the variance nor would adjoining properties suffer substantial detriment.*

xvii. Will the variance adversely affect the delivery of governmental services, including but not limited to, access by firefighting apparatus, law enforcement vehicles, ambulance and emergency vehicles and similar services relative to ingress and egress to the affected site and adjacent land?

Granting the variance would actually improve access by allowing connection to adjacent subdivision

*No.*

xviii. Explain whether the Subdivision Regulation was in effect at the time of acquisition of the property by the applicant and whether the applicant purchased the property with the knowledge of the Regulation.

Applicant has a purchase agreement on the property and has knowledge of the regulation. As mentioned above, the variance will improve access for governmental services, and is very close to required minimum/maximum.

*Yes.*

xix. Explain whether the applicant’s predicament can be feasibly solved through some method other than a variance.

As mentioned above, the existing roadway and pond locations result in a very specific intersection relationship and geometry.

*The applicant’s predicament cannot be feasibly solved through another method other than a variance due to the geography of the parcel and the existing roadways.*

xx. Explain how the variance from the Subdivision Regulations will not be contrary to the public interest.

As mentioned above, the variance would improve access by allowing connection to adjacent subdivision.

*This variance would not be contrary to public interest as the access and use would not pose a threat/concern to public safety or the character of the neighborhood.*

xxi. Explain how the spirit and intent behind the Subdivision Regulations will be
observed if the variance is granted.

As mentioned above, the variance is very minimal and the design is very close to the spirit and intent behind the Subdivision Regulations.

*The spirit and intent of the following purposes and objectives of the Regulations as listed in § 1101.02 WOULD be observed if the Variances were granted:*

(i) The proper arrangement of streets or highways in relation to existing or proposed streets and highways and the thoroughfare plan.  
*This would be part of connecting existing road networks.*

(j) Adequate and convenient open spaces for traffic, utilities, access for firefighting apparatus, recreation, light and air, and the avoidance of congestion of the population.  
*This would not affect the above.*

(k) The orderly, efficient, and appropriate development of land.  
*This would not affect the orderly, efficient and appropriate development of land.*

(l) The orderly and efficient provision of community facilities at minimum cost and maximum convenience.  
*This would not impact the orderly and efficient provision of community facilities.*

(m) Safe and convenient vehicular and pedestrian movement.  
*This would not impact vehicular and pedestrian movement.*

(n) The promotion of public health, safety, comfort, convenience, prosperity, and general welfare, and the protection of the environment.  
*This would not affect the promotion of public health, safety, comfort, convenience, prosperity, and general welfare, and the protection of the environment.*

(o) The accurate surveying of land, preparing and recording of plats.  
*This would not impact the accurate surveying of land, preparing and recording of plats.*

(p) The equitable handling of all subdivision plats by providing uniform procedures and standards for observance by both the approving authority and Developer as defined herein.  
*This variance is required for the current layout as approved by the Township.*

xxii. Explain how the requested variance is the minimum variance to the Subdivision Regulations that will allow for a reasonable division of land.

As mentioned above, the existing roadway and pond locations result in a very specific intersection relationship and geometry.

*The requested variance is the minimum variance required for the reasonable division of land.*
Staff Comments: Variances are to alleviate unnecessary hardships imposed by literal enforcement of the subdivision regulations due to exceptional topographic or other physical conditions peculiar to a parcel.

- The requested variance is the minimum variance required.
- The location of lakes, wetlands, and existing roadway tie ins limit the potential locations of roadways.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends the SCPC APPROVE the Variance Request.
1c. Preliminary Plan:


- There are two roadways proposed
  - Proposed Road A, with an ingress and egress onto Liberty Road that turns at the intersection with Proposed Road B and ends in a cul-de-sac
  - Proposed Road B, that runs from the terminus of Fenmore Lane and ends at the intersection with Proposed Road A.
- There are two water quality basin’s proposed.

Site Conditions: Wetlands have been identified on the fringes of the property. The FEMA Flood Rate Insurance Map shows the Lakes in the Flood Rate “A” Zone. This is defined as an area subject to inundation by a 1 percent chance flood.

Township Zoning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Municipality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>R-1-E</td>
<td>Residential low density</td>
<td>City of Solon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>PDD</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Reminderville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>PDD</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Reminderville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>PUD</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>City of Twinsburg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agency Comments: Italicized text indicates quotations from submitted agency comments.

SCE: Andy Dunchuck, 12/06/2019: Our office has reviewed the above referenced preliminary plan and the comments are listed below. Please note, the Summit County Engineer’s Office does not recommend the approval of this subdivision due to the number and nature of the following comments. The issues raised are not easily corrected without significant re-design of the property. This office requests the developer revise the design and once again re-submit the development.

Review Comments

1. What is the status of Planning Commission’s previous requirement to submit and obtain a FEMA Map Revision for the 100-Year Flood Plain?

2. A portion of the proposed stormwater management basin located between Ponds 1 and 2 is located within the 100-Year Flood Plain. Section 8.5 of the SCE Stormwater Drainage Manual prohibits stormwater management facilities being placed within the limits of a designated flood plain.
3. A portion of the maintenance access drive for the proposed stormwater management basin located to the East of Pond 1 is located within the 100-Year Flood Plain. In addition, the drive does not extend around the entire perimeter of the basin.

4. Portions of Sublots 22-24 and 30-35 are located within the 100-Year Flood Plain.

5. Subdivision Regulation 1105.04 requires the block length for a residential street not exceed 1,500’. Proposed ‘Roadway A’ has a block length of approximately 1,700’.

6. Subdivision Regulation 1108.07(f) requires intersecting streets to have a minimum tangent distance of 100’. Proposed ‘Roadway B’ has a tangent distance of 73.6’.

7. A 100-Year Overland Flow Path across the site is required.

8. The maintenance access driveways shall be designed to withstand maintenance equipment and vehicles and shall consist of an approved material.

9. A 2.5’ wide ODOT Curb and Gutter section and ODOT No. 3 and 3A Catch Basins is required in the design of the proposed roadway.

10. The traffic impact study requires construction of a southbound left turn lane into the proposed development. In addition, removal of vegetation on the East and West sides of Liberty road is required to achieve adequate Stopping Sight Distance and Intersection Sight Distance.

Dept. of Building Standards: 2019: Regarding the retreat at liberty lakes it appears that part of the allotment is in the floodplain. To build homes in the floodplain the requirements are the lowest level of the structure would have to be one foot higher than base flood elevation. As of now it appears that base flood elevation has not been determined. The only other option would be to request a letter of map amendment that would be submitted to FEMA for approval to remove the property from the floodplain.


Since that date, following discussions with Twinsburg Township and receipt of the Preliminary JD letter from the developer we have the following addendums to that letter:

1.) Riparian Setbacks: A small stream was identified on the Summit County Soil survey. Following a site visit and the Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination from US Army Corps, this drainageway was determined to not have a defined bed and bank, therefore it does not meet the criteria to be considered a stream under Summit County Chapter 937 and Twinsburg Township’s riparian regulations. Further, though the south pond is in line with a stream, ponds are not included in the regulatory scope of Twinsburg Township’s riparian regulations. Therefore, there are no concerns with riparian setbacks on this parcel.

2.) FEMA floodplain: Homes, backyards and a portion of the proposed stormwater management pond impact the 100 year FEMA floodplain. Per the preliminary plan, the developer is proposing a revision to the 100 year flood plain. The developer will need to provide confirmation from FEMA that the floodplain boundaries have been revised. If the floodplain boundaries are not
revised, the proposed floodplain impacts must obtain approval from Summit County Engineers and the County Floodplain Coordinator.

DSSS: Ross Nicholson, 12/04/2019: DSSS has reviewed the Liberty Lakes Revised Preliminary Plan as requested. We generally have no objection to the proposed preliminary plan, however our general comments relative to the submitted plans are as follows:

1) The sanitary sewer should be kept on the west side of Liberty Road until it crosses Liberty Road at the proposed new street;

2) A sanitary manhole should be located at the proposed project phase line to allow sanitary sewer construction to be consistent with the phase lines;

3) The eastern portion of the development will not have sanitary sewer service at basement elevations, due to the topography of the site;

4) As a result of Comment No. 3, the use of hung plumbing to serve basements at the indicated location should be specifically noted in the plan set.

It is anticipated that DSSS concerns will addressed on the detailed design plan set submittal.

Staff Comments:

- The Plan requires two Variances
  - 1105.04(a) Blocks (1,500' required, 1,714.8' provided – 214.8' variance)
  - 1108.07(f) Street Intersections (100' tangent required, 73.6' provided – 26.4' variance)
- Lots 22 and 23 have their building areas within the 100 year flood plain and lots 30-35 have a portion of the lot within the 100 year flood plain. Subdivision Regulation 1105.02 Suitability of Land (b) Flood hazards states “Land subject to flooding and land otherwise uninhabitable shall not be platted for residential occupancy nor for such other uses that may increase danger to health, life, or property, or aggravate the flood hazard as delineated on the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps, or detailed engineering study. Furthermore building areas are not encouraged in the Floodway Fringe.” – Until a map revision it seems that these lots are to be discouraged from development.

Recommendation: It is Staff’s recommendation that the SCPC Conditionally Approve this Preliminary Plan with the conditions being the developer must obtain a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLMR) or a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) from FIMA (Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration a division of FEMA) regarding the floodplain limits and their impacts for stormwater detention on the above referenced site, and to show the base flood elevation as determined by the CLMR or LOMR on the preliminary plan, as well as satisfying the comments from the Summit County Engineer’s Office, Summit Soil and Water and the Department of Sanitary Sewer Services.
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February 17, 2020

Summit County Engineer
538 E. South Street
Akron, OH 44311

Attn: Andy Dunchuck, P.E., CPESC, CPSWQ
Email: adunchuck@summitiengineer.net

RE: Retreat at Liberty Lakes
Revised Preliminary Plan Comments
Liberty Road, Twinsburg Township, Ohio
File No. 14162-009A-County Engineer.docx

Dear Mr. Dunchuck,

Our office is in receipt of review comments from your office dated December 6, 2019, regarding the revised Preliminary Plans submittal (dated September 24, 2019). We have also addressed comments from the December 19, 2019 Summit County Planning Commission Meeting and the subsequent staff meeting of January 4, 2020.) We want to point out that we are seeking Preliminary Plan approval and understand that certain conditional items will need to be resolved prior to final approval. The following are responses to your initial comments:

1. What is the status of Planning Commission’s previous requirement to submit and obtain a FEMA Map Revision for the 100-Year Flood Plain?

An updated CLOMR has been prepared based on FEMA’s initial comments. The application materials were provided to your office. The only thing we are waiting on to submit this application is a signature from Reminderville Engineer on the MT-2 forms. We have been working diligently with them to get this completed and have been informed it is forthcoming. The Engineer for the Village of Reminderville has signed the application and it was mailed to FEMA last month with notice of receipt obtained in Late January 2020. We are confident the application will be approved.

2. A portion of the proposed stormwater management basin located between Ponds 1 and 2 is located within the 100-Year Flood Plain. Section 8.5 of the SCE Stormwater Drainage Manual prohibits stormwater management facilities being placed within the limits of a designated flood plain.

A hydraulic analysis has been completed by Hydrosphere Engineering which shows that the proposed stormwater management bases will clearly be out of the floodplain.
As mentioned above, we are working with FEMA to modify the mapped floodplain limits. We understand that final approval will not be granted until this has been confirmed by FEMA. We will keep you updated on the status of this application.

3. **A portion of the maintenance access drive for the proposed stormwater management basin located to the East of Pond 1 is located within the 100-Year Flood Plain. In addition, the drive does not extend around the entire perimeter of the basin.**

   A. See response #1 and #2 regarding 100-Year Flood Plain.
   
   B. The access drive around the basin has been modified to address this comment and is illustrated on the submitted plan.

4. **Portions of Sublots 22-24 and 30-35 are located within the 100-Year Flood Plain.**

   See response #1 and #2. The revised floodplain mapping will remove these lots from the 100-year flood plain. After our meeting with engineering, soil and water, legal and a member of the planning committee, we made a decision to continue forward with lots 22 & 23. You will see that we have satisfied the concerns on potential flooding and water migration into the homes on lots 22 & 23 from our February 13, 2020 letter addressed to Jim O’Connor with Pulte. We do again recognize that the CLMR is one of the contingent items for the preliminary approval.

5. **Subdivision Regulation 1105.04 requires the block length for a residential street not exceed 1,500’. Proposed ‘Roadway A’ has a block length of approximately 1,700’**.

   A variance was granted in the previous preliminary approval for a block length of 1,693.4’. We will be seeking a variance again with a slight increase for a total of 1,714.8’. This slight increase was due to modification required to create the additional stormwater management basins.

6. **Subdivision Regulation 1108.07(f) requires intersecting streets to have a minimum tangent distance of 100’. Proposed ‘Roadway B’ has a tangent distance of 73.6’**.

   A variance was granted in the previous preliminary approval for 88.9’. We will be seeking a variance again with a slight adjustment resulting in 73.6’. This slight increase was due to modification required to create the additional stormwater management basins.

7. **A 100-Year Overland Flow Path across the site is required.**

   A 100-year overland flow path has been provided. *We have included an exhibit with calculations for the proposed culvert between SL 17 & SL 18. The 100 yr storm elevation in this area is maintained within the proposed culvert and does not overtop the proposed channel in this area. Further design calculations can be provided during the final improvement plan phase.*
8. The maintenance access driveways shall be designed to withstand maintenance equipment and vehicles and shall consist of an approved material.

Maintenance access driveway will be provided and design approved by Summit County Engineering. The revised plan as submitted on December 17, 2019 and resubmitted on February 6, 2020 does show the reconfigured access drives around the ponds per the Engineering Department requirement.

9. A 2.5’ wide ODOT Curb and Gutter section and ODOT No. 3 and 3A Catch Basins is required in the design of the proposed roadway

We have modified curb to the county standard which will also be included in the final improvement plans.

10. The traffic impact study requires construction of a southbound left turn lane into the proposed development. In addition, removal of vegetation on the East and West sides of Liberty road is required to achieve adequate Stopping Sight Distance and Intersection Sight Distance.

Pulte has met with the property owners that will require the minor clearing. They have agreed to the clearing and easements for future maintenance. Details of these agreements will be provided with the final improvement plans.

IN SUMMARY:

The Preliminary Plans are submitted for approval with the following required variance modifications from the first approval in 2018. The variances are as follows:

A. Variance from the subdivision regulations 1105.04(a) Blocks, the regulation have a 1,500’ block length maximum, a 1,714.8 long block is proposed requiring a 214.8’ variance.
B. Section 1108.07(f) Street Intersections require a 100” tangent, a 73.6’ is proposed requiring a 26.4’ variance.

Note these are very similar to the variances granted in the first preliminary plan approval granted in 2019.

In addition, the applicant understands the preliminary approval of the plan as submitted will require conditions attached to the preliminary approval and they are as follows:

1. Upon approval of the Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) submitted to FEMA for the development including obtaining a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR), the storm water facilities shall be above the 100 year flood elevation.
2. Obtain wetland permits for the required impacts prior to disturbing any of the wetlands.
3. Based on the Traffic Impact Study there is a need to install a southbound left lane into the proposed development. This will need to be completed when the second phase is constructed and the connection to Fenmore Lane is made.
4. Based on the traffic study and existing conditions survey the additional clearing of vegetation will be required to provide for proper site and stopping distance.

5. A 100-Hundred Overland Flow path has been established and the design subject to final engineering approval.

6. The required maintenance access drive has been modified and does go around both proposed basins. The design of the drive will need to withstand maintenance equipment and final design approved by Engineering.

If you have any questions, or need any additional information, please do not hesitate to call. We look forward to obtaining preliminary approval so we can move this project into final design.

Sincerely,

Daniel J. Neff, P.E.
Principal

cc. Stephen Knittel – Summit County
    Tim Boley – Summit County
    Alan Brubaker – Summit County
    Joe Paradise – Summit County
    Larry Fulton – Summit County
    Brian Uhlenbrock – Neff & Associates
    Edward Keaton – Neff & Associates
    Jim O’Connor – Pulte Group
    Brad Piroli – Pulte Group
    Dave Francesconi – Pulte Group
Hydrograph Report

Hyd. No. 1

Pre-A

Hydrograph type = SCS Runoff
Storm frequency = 100 yrs
Time interval = 1 min
Drainage area = 9.160 ac
Basin Slope = 0.0 %
Tc method = User
Total precip. = 5.50 in
Storm duration = 24 hrs

Peak discharge = 53.46 cfs
Time to peak = 11.98 hrs
Hyd. volume = 124,053 cuft
Curve number = 84*
Hydraulic length = 0 ft
Time of conc. (Tc) = 10.00 min
Distribution = Type II
Shape factor = 484

* Composite (Area/CN) = [(7.330 x 80) + (1.830 x 98)] / 9.160
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Culvert Report

Liberty Lakes Culvert

Invert Elev Dn (ft) = 1030.00
Pipe Length (ft) = 87.34
Slope (%) = 0.76
Invert Elev Up (ft) = 1030.66
Rise (in) = 48.0
Shape = Circular
Span (in) = 48.0
No. Barrels = 1
n-Value = 0.013
Culvert Type = Circular Concrete
Culvert Entrance = Square edge w/headwall (C)
Coeff. K,M,c,Y,k = 0.0098, 2, 0.0398, 0.67, 0.5

Calculations
Qmin (cfs) = 26.46
Qmax (cfs) = 55.00
Tailwater Elev (ft) = (dc+D)/2

Highlighted
Qtot (cfs) = 53.46
Qpipe (cfs) = 53.46
Qovertop (cfs) = 0.00
Veloc Dn (ft/s) = 5.12
Veloc Up (ft/s) = 7.53
HGL Dn (ft) = 1033.10
HGL Up (ft) = 1032.87
Hw Elev (ft) = 1033.91
Hw/D (ft) = 0.81
Flow Regime = Inlet Control

Embarkment
Top Elevation (ft) = 1036.83
Top Width (ft) = 25.00
Crest Width (ft) = 0.00
Proposal: Richfield Township Zoning Commission is proposing an amendment of Article IV, Section 420-2 Use Regulations for the LI-O Light Industrial-Office District to remove text about special conditions for warehouse uses and distribution center uses.

Proposed Text Amendments: Text that is struck through is text proposed for deletion, new proposed text is underlined.

420-2 F Special Conditions for Warehouse Uses

1. Wholesale uses or warehousing and/or storage uses shall not occupy more than forty percent (40%) of the gross floor area of any building.

2. Each permitted building shall have at least twenty-five percent (25%) of its total gross floor area devoted to permitted office or light industrial uses.

420-2 G Special Conditions for Distribution Center Uses

Each permitted building shall have at least fifteen percent (15%) of its total gross floor area devoted to permitted office uses.

Richfield Township

ARTICLE IV
Section 420 LI-O LIGHT INDUSTRIAL - OFFICE DISTRICT
Section 420-1 Purpose The purpose of the Light Industrial-Office District regulations is to create a light industrial employment center intended to attract a diversity of employment opportunities and high quality buildings, facilities and uses that will enhance the tax base of the Township while minimizing the impact on the adjacent residential districts. The Light Industrial-Office District regulations reflect the intent to require light industrially related uses to have access to major arterial roadways to minimize impact on local roads. Permitted uses encourage the development of large-scale office, light industrial and business parks built of quality architectural grade finish materials with long term, low maintenance characteristics.
The District is adjacent to residential districts and also contains significant sensitive environmental areas, in particular wetlands and streams that are part of the Columbia Run system of the Cuyahoga Valley National Park. The District regulations thus require all new development uses and locations to be sited in consideration of these environmentally sensitive areas and, to the maximum extent feasible, leave such areas as natural, open spaces.

Section 420-2 Use Regulations

All uses not specifically identified as permitted or conditionally permitted are prohibited. All uses cited in Appendix B are also prohibited.

A. Principal Permitted Uses

The following uses are considered principal permitted uses subject to compliance with all the requirements set forth in the Zoning Resolution and the application review and approval procedures. The uses cited in Appendix B are wholly excluded.

1. Commercial/Retail Uses, as specifically set forth are permitted as follows, if conducted entirely within an enclosed building.
   a. Banks or other financial institutions subject to the conditions set forth in Section 420.2 (E) below.
   b. Commercial nurseries and wholesale garden centers
   c. Medical clinics
   d. Business and professional offices not located in a business park
   e. Recording, radio or television studios
   f. Restaurants subject to the conditions set forth in Section 420.2 (E) below
   g. Retail uses subject to the conditions set forth in Section 420.2 (E) below
   h. Business, personal or non-vehicle repair services
   i. Showrooms and salesrooms for wholesale distribution subject to the conditions set forth in Section 420.2(F)
   j. Wholesale trade

2. Light Industrial Uses, as specifically set forth are permitted as follows if conducted entirely within an enclosed building.
   a. Light Industrial uses including manufacturing, processing, assembly and packaging of materials and goods into products. The uses cited in Appendix B are wholly excluded.
   b. Research laboratories including:
      (i) Research in all the sciences
      (ii) Product testing and development
      (iii) Product engineering development, or
      (iv) Market development
   c. Distribution Centers
   d. Warehousing and/or storage within a completely enclosed building subject to the conditions set forth in Section 420.2(F) below.
   e. Workshops and custom small industry uses such as woodworking, tool and die, etc.

3. Institutional/Civic/Public Uses, as specifically set forth are permitted as follows:
a. Essential public utility and public services installations including bus stops and shelters, but not power generating stations, transit transfer stations or outdoor storage.
b. Public Recreation facilities including multipurpose trails for non-motorized travel only.


B. Principally Permitted Accessory Uses

1. Definition

Accessory uses and structures are those that are necessarily and customarily incidental and subordinate to the principal uses allowed in the district, unless specifically prohibited as set forth in Appendix B. Accessory structures should be devised to be visually compatible with the main building. Accessory uses shall be subject to the following regulations in addition to the same regulations that apply to principal permitted uses. The uses cited in Appendix B are wholly excluded.

2. The permitted accessory uses are set forth as follows:
   a. Television/Communication Satellite Dishes larger than one (1) meter in diameter shall be considered structures, requiring a permit and subject to front, side and rear setbacks applicable to the district. The dish shall not be located in the setback area abutting a residential district. The area surrounding the dish shall be landscaped to minimize visual impact on any adjoining residential district property. Landscaping shall be completed within one hundred eighty (180) days of installation of the satellite dish and maintained thereafter.
   b. Cafeterias, dining halls, day care and recreational services when operated within the primary building and for the convenience of employees, clients, customers or visitors of the Principal Use.
   c. Gates and Guard Houses.
   d. Signs – as set forth in Section 506 of the Zoning Resolution.
   e. Parking Garages for employees, customers and visitors of the Principal Use.
   f. Fences, Walls, and Hedges may abut side and rear property lines but must adhere to front yard setbacks and have a maximum height of eight (8) feet, unless a higher maximum height is required within another section of this zoning resolution.

3. Accessory Use Development and Operational Standards
   a. Maximum Detached Accessory Building Size: Buildings shall not be larger than 1,000 square feet except if an accessory parking facility or recreation facility.
   b. Maximum number of Accessory Buildings: The maximum number of accessory buildings shall be two (2) per lot.
   c. Building Separation: Unless attached to the principal building, accessory structures shall be located at least ten (10) feet from any other structure.

C. Conditional Uses

The following uses shall be conditionally permitted in the Light Industrial-Office District subject to meeting all applicable requirements set forth in Sections 420-4 and 420-5 as
well as all general requirements set forth in the Zoning Resolution and the application and site plan review procedures as provided in Section 420-6. The uses cited in Appendix B are wholly excluded.

1. Commercial/Retail Uses, as specifically set forth are conditionally permitted as follows:
   a. Automotive, Truck, Farm and Excavating Equipment Repair and Services but not including wrecking or salvage, provided that any accessory retail sales use shall not exceed 5,000 square feet in gross floor area.
   b. Automotive, Truck, Farm and Excavating Equipment Dealers
   c. Commercial Operations that involve operation, parking and maintenance of vehicles or cleaning of equipment, truck and transfer terminals, storage of goods or work processes involving solvents, except for uses listed in Appendix B.
   d. Commercial recreational or sports training facilities.
   e. Vehicle and equipment rentals.
   f. Sexually Oriented Businesses.
   g. Office Business Parks - Subdivision Developments
   h. Junk Yards
   i. Commercial nurseries and wholesale garden centers not conducted entirely within an enclosed building

2. Light Industrial Uses, as specifically set forth are conditionally permitted as follows:
   a. Wireless telecommunications towers.
   b. Truck and Transfer Terminals when storage is conducted wholly within an enclosed building (not subject to 420-2-F). Loading Space areas shall be included in the enclosed building and trucks loaded and unloaded from an opening only large enough to gain access to the semi-tractor trailer interior. No loading, unloading or storage shall occur outside of the building except for automotive, truck, farm and excavating equipment dealers.
   c. Light Industrial Business Parks – Subdivision Developments.
   d. Oil and Gas Exploration.

3. Institutional/Civic/Public Uses, as specifically set forth are conditionally permitted as follows:
   a. Conference Centers
   b. Government facilities, Offices and Services
   c. Public Safety and Emergency Services


D. Conditionally Permitted Accessory Uses

1. Definition:
   Accessory uses and structures that are necessarily and customarily incidental and subordinate to the conditional uses allowed in the district, unless specifically prohibited as set forth in Appendix B. Accessory Structures should be designed to be visually compatible with the main building. Accessory uses shall be subject
to the following regulations in addition to the same regulations that apply to principal permitted uses. The uses cited in Appendix B are wholly excluded.

2. The following conditionally permitted accessory uses are set forth as follows:
   a. Television/Communication Satellite Dishes larger than one (1) meter in diameter shall be considered structures, requiring a permit and subject to front, side and rear setbacks applicable to the district. The dish shall not be located in the setback area abutting a residential district. The area surrounding the dish shall be landscaped to minimize visual impact on any adjoining residential district property. Landscaping shall be completed within one hundred eighty (180) days of installation of the satellite dish and maintained thereafter.
   b. Cafeterias, dining halls, day care and recreational services when operated within the primary building and for the convenience of employees, clients, customers or visitors of the Principal Use.
   c. Gates and Guard Houses.
   d. Signs – as set forth in Section 506 of the Zoning Resolution.
   e. Parking Garages for employees, customers and visitors of the Principal Use.
   f. Fences, Walls, and Hedges may abut side and rear property lines but must adhere to front yard setbacks and have a maximum height of eight (8) feet, unless a higher maximum height is required within another section of this district.

3. Accessory Use Development and Operational Standards
   a. Maximum Building Size: Buildings shall not be larger than one thousand (1,000) square feet, except if an accessory parking facility or recreation facility.
   b. Maximum number of Accessory Buildings: The maximum number of accessory buildings shall be two (2) per lot.
   c. Building Separation: Unless attached to the principal building, accessory structures shall be located at least ten (10) feet from any other structure.

E. Special Conditions for Principally Permitted or Conditionally Permitted Commercial and Retail Uses. Principally or conditionally permitted commercial and retail uses that reference this subsection, shall not be permitted in the Light Industrial-Office District unless all of the following conditions are met:
   1. The commercial or retail use shall not be the principal permitted use in any freestanding building.
   2. The commercial or retail area shall not occupy more than ten thousand (10,000) square feet in gross floor area or twenty (20) percent of the gross floor area of any building, whichever is smaller.

F. Special Conditions for Warehouse Uses
   1. Wholesale uses or warehousing and/or storage uses shall not occupy more than forty percent (40%) of the gross floor area of any building.
   2. Each permitted building shall have at least twenty-five percent (25%) of its total gross floor area devoted to permitted office or light industrial uses.

G. Special Conditions for Distribution Center Uses
Each permitted building shall have at least fifteen percent (15%) of its total gross floor area devoted to permitted office uses.

Comments:
- Proposal is to remove text about special conditions for warehouse uses and distribution center uses.

Recommendation: Staff recommends to the Summit County Planning Commission that the proposed text amendments be APPROVED.
February 17, 2020

Department of Community & Economic Development
County of Summit, Ilene Shapiro, Executive
175 S. Main St., Suite 103, Room 113
Akron, OH 44038

RE: Richfield Township Zoning Text Amendment

Dear Summit County Planning Commission:

BACKGROUND

Before this planning commission is a request by Richfield Township to delete existing regulations, which are under Richfield Township Zoning Resolution Article IV, Section 420-2 Use Regulations for LI-O Light Industrial-Office District:

420-2-F Special Conditions for Warehouse Uses

- Wholesale uses or warehousing and/or storage uses shall not occupy more than forty percent (40%) of the gross floor area of any building.
- Each permitted building shall have at least twenty-five percent (25%) of its total gross area devoted to permitted office or light industrial uses.

420-2-G Special Conditions for Distribution Center Uses

Each permitted building shall have at least fifteen percent (15%) of its total gross floor area devoted to permitted offices uses.

I, Paul Caruso, am the owner of approximately 5 acres of land fronting Dewey Road and adjacent to the east side of LI-O property. My property is identified by the Summit County Fiscal Officer as Parcel # 48-02525. My property, like others adjacent to the South and East of the LI-O district, are located in a district zoned R-1 (Residential).

My primary concern with deleting existing regulations is that the building(s) will be used solely as a warehouse or, more specifically, distribution center(s). As such, it (they) will operate 24 hours a day causing additional traffic, noise and other disruptions. At the same time, warehousing use of the property will provide little benefit to the Township, while potentially being an economic burden.

BASIS FOR OPPOSITION

As this commission is well aware, the Zoning Resolution was drafted with thoughtful planning and a purpose to protect the interests of the community. The purpose of a Light Industrial District as stated in Section 420 is to “attract a diversity of employment...while minimizing the impact on adjacent residential districts.” Freely deleting existing regulations derides this process.

Furthermore, Section 1001-2, Contents of Application for Amendment to Zoning Resolution says all applications for a zoning amendment shall include:
A. Evidence that the existing Zoning Resolution is unreasonable with respect to the particular property, and it deprives the property owner of his lawful and reasonable use of the land. For the purposes of this Zoning Resolution, a limitation upon the financial gain from the land in question shall not constitute unreasonable zoning.

B. Evidence that the proposed amendment would materialize in an equal or better Zoning Resolution than that existing.

C. A statement giving the names and addresses of the owners of all properties lying within one thousand (1,000) feet of any part of the property, the zoning of which would be changed by the proposed amendment, if enacted.

In this case, Richfield Township Zoning Commission is acting as the Applicant. The Zoning Commission's initiation does not alleviate its obligation to adhere to current zoning regulations as an applicant. Specifically, the Zoning Commission has offered no evidence as it relates to 1001-2-A and 1001-2-B. Quite simply, there has been no evidence that the current zoning resolution is depriving the property owner of "his lawful and reasonable use of the land" nor has there been any evidence that the proposed amendment would materialize in an equal or better zoning resolution than the existing.

The Zoning Resolution has set forth minimum requirements of office space in Light industrial districts for a purpose, one of these being to attract employment opportunities and a revenue base. Office space generally results in more employment per square foot and tax dollars due to a greater number of employees, lighter impact on the Township infrastructure and less disruption to neighboring properties. Warehousing requires less of an employment base, and is subject to further reductions as automation, such as self-driving forklifts, robotic palletizers and conveyor belts are being increasingly implemented in warehouse operations. A 2018 study by Logistics Management showed distribution center automation increased by 48% vs 2017 while employment expansion declined by 3%. The Township and the property owners should work jointly to find business owners that would provide mixed warehouse and office space use or primary office type businesses (ex. Law Firm, Payroll Company etc) that will lead to greater economic benefits while minimizing disruption to neighboring properties instead of solely relying on distribution centers.

Another purpose of the Zoning Resolution is to limit disruptions to adjoining residential properties. However, the business conducted through a warehouse or distribution center creates such disruptions. If office space requirements are removed, it will be conducive to an increase in truck traffic. Warehouses or distribution centers imply the use of trucks and other vehicles. All of these cause noise. For instance, a semi-truck emits 65-80 decibels. The Zoning Resolution sets a 55-decibel threshold for sound emitted to neighboring residential properties. While a proposed 10’ wall will restrict some of the sound, EPA and Department of Transportation studies show that a solid 10’ continuous wall only lowers noise by 5 decibels. Therefore, even with the deleted zoning texts, there are legitimate concerns of other violations of the zoning regulations.

On February 10th, Richfield Township's Board of Zoning Appeals heard Case No. 642-20, the request for a variance so that the owner in the LI-O district could build a building that 1. Exceed maximum requirements of warehouse floor area, 2. Not meet minimum requirements for office/light industrial floor area and/or 3. Not meet minimum requirements for office space floor area. This variance request was denied by the Board of Zoning Appeals. The board of zoning appeals denied the request yet the zoning commission (Trustees) went ahead and filed an initiation with Summit County to amend this very text. It would appear that even the Township's own boards aren't in agreement.
In the Summer of 2018, Richfield Township Trustees initiated an amendment with Summit County Planning Commission to change the zoning code for the LI-O district. This proposal ultimately went to a referendum vote in November 2018 and FAILED. Sixty-nine percent (69%) voted against the zoning code changes while only thirty-one percent (31%) approved the changes. On two separate occasions, now, the Trustees are displaying a complete disregard to the general public, zoning regulations and other boards within the Township.

Based on the forgoing, this Board should deny Richfield Township's application. The property can be used as currently zoned and amending the texts would provide no benefit to the Township. The Trustees have failed to provide any evidence for their case as required under 1001-2-A and 1001-2-B, the proposed changes could result in other zoning violations such as noise, the Board of Zoning Appeals denied a variance request for reducing office space, and lastly, the residents of the Township voted down these changes less than two years ago.

Regards,

Paul A. Caruso