

**BRIMFIELD TOWNSHIP ZONING COMMISSION**

**PUBLIC MEETING**

**MINUTES of June 8, 2017 at 7:00 PM**

Brimfield Town Hall Community Room – 1333 Tallmadge Road, Brimfield, Ohio 44240

**Present:** Chairman Ron Jones                      V.P. Gary Rodd                      Debbie Darlas

William Kremer                      Tom Sargent

**Alternates:** Thomas Johnson                      Pat Blair

**Staff Present:** Dick Messner, Zoning Inspector  
Wendi O’Neal, Assistant Zoning Inspector, Secretary of Board

**Public Present:**                      NONE

The Zoning Commission is called to order by **Chairman Ron Jones**, at 7:00 PM on **Thursday, June 8, 2017** at the Brimfield Township Town Hall.

Roll call:

**Darlas:** Here                      **Jones:** Here                      **Kremer:** Here                      **Rodd:** Here  
**Sargent:** Here                      **Johnson:** Here                      **Blair:** Here

**MOTION #2017-20**

**William Kremer** makes a motion to accept the Agenda as presented and was seconded by **Tom Sargent**. Motion passes unanimously.

**MOTION #2017-21**

A motion is made by **William Kremer** to approve the May 11, 2017 Meeting Minutes with a seconded from **Debbie Darlas**. Motion passes unanimously.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

**Dick Messner:** No old business at this time.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

- **Town Center District (T-C) – Section 308.00** RE: Green Hills Golf Course – Note\* T-C
  - ♦ **Section 308.01 – Purpose**
  - ♦ **Section 308.02 – Uses**

**Wendi O’Neal** – Gave the Board members a work sheet with the changes discussed last month: ‘encourage’ changed to ‘shall’, single family detached homes deletion plus a list of discussion points: Encourages to shall, T-C Applications go to BZA, Architectural Review Committee, Density – apartments, Mixed-use mandatory, Uses: Permitted vs. Conditionally Permitted.

The following were discussions and/or questions discussed:

- 308.02 Uses: If the addition of a space requirement for the mandatory mixed-use for a one-acre lot; combination is going to be harder to develop with smaller land or leave it to let BZA regulate?
  - ♦ Covered in main phrase in 308.02.
  - ♦ Developer could use second floor apartments, first floor commercial; easier bi-level.
  - ♦ T-C District currently has minimum lot area of none.
  - ♦ Something should be listed.
  - ♦ History: originally from proposed Casamento’s second floor rentals, first floor offices; due to acreage would be a zero-lot requirement. 13-14 years ago, T-C never materialized, blame whoever changing whole concept.
    - Asks if the T-C as it was formed originally still a viable zoning district? If not what is going to replace it? And are we going to replace with the same geographic area?
    - If not working, trustees didn’t buy in with financing, not viable district anymore. Could change it or shrink it say 200 feet both sides of center intersection, rezoning the

## BRIMFIELD TOWNSHIP ZONING COMMISSION

surrounding. Could throw out T-C make it I-C or start new district. If keeping retail/commercial isn't bad; work on residential. If city planning commission = more authority which then could list A-D submission and could say must be mixed-use with so much allocated. Example: building 75% commercial, 25% residential. Of could be five/ten acres and all residential housing not having mixed use falls under subdivision regulations which could have own setup for T-C: \_\_\_# dwellings per acre, bonus density program and follow R-3, R-2, R-4 district. Or other options: making more light-industrial as it is it would be contiguous and compatible with the Karg Industrial Park.

- ♦ Worries about lawsuit on just singling out a change on one parcel.
- ♦ Different option to make all R-3 compatible to across the street or other option getting the residential worded in a way that controls it within limits.
- ♦ Wants to keep T-C district, at minimum 200-feet in each direction of the center. Even though not completed, like what there is (a good thing), hate to see fall apart. Would do some tweaking, but not to shrink the district.
- ♦ Further discuss residential, review both permitted and conditionally permitted uses, state any proposed of majority of land use is residential has to have a certain percentage of commercial. Old PUD – 100 acres, 25% infrastructure, 10% 'may be' used (wasn't mandatory) for commercial; 100 acres, 25% for CAN, open space and 10% commercial.
- ♦ Discusses the acreage of golf course, 76 acres; southwest corner are wetlands, unbuildable could be part of open space or restricted open space, or secluded from open space. The wetlands are closest Karg Industrial Parkway with small section near cemetery; retention ditch there and clay tiles run into cemetery. Explained the flooding on the property that was there prior to Brimfield Crossings installation of the underground storm water storage tanks which mitigated 80% and when developed will mitigate 90% rerouting it to Plum Creek.
- ♦ Questions regarding the intentions of residential in the T-C, if desired to not have more in the future. Over 20 acres or parcels split into five or more, subdivision regulations are followed, limit density and encourage more commercial; doesn't want more residential.
- ♦ Possible option to change in Chapter Four, Ten, Section 56 or possibly 15, 53, 62, 63 conditional requirements, Chapter Five: environmental protection standards regarding buffering area on residential lots covered in EPA requirements with storm water management systems. Chapter Three editing is more what the Board is referring to determining how to control and ideal residential is two story, simplest way is to ensure mixed use, dwelling per acres, single family attached vs. detached and determining permitted and conditionally permitted uses.
- ♦ Architectural review committee discussion. States other townships are making changes original from Anderson Township around Cincinnati, with Shalersville and Rootstown adopting amendments; Regional Planning is creating one uniform for townships to use for the county. Needed clarification if the architectural/engineer on the committee would have to reside in township our just could operate a business in the township, like Mike Wolhwend. Board requests the materials to review, asks if one could be designed specifically for the T-C or for the whole township (commercially, residentially or both, if possible); would have to find out.
- ♦ Discussed the possible maximum number of dwellings that could be developed with the current restrictions being 75% of total 76 acres, over 200 units. Does not want to over-populate small area, has to be changed.
- ♦ Discussed deleting permitted use residential, leaving permitted commercial use, expand mixed-use facilities and conditionally permitted multi-family dwelling at desired ensuring mixed-use: like to keep to minimum, likes mixed-use with a percentage requirement, if not wanting clusters, meaning larger homes, possibly regulating setbacks. Likes Tallmadge Road setback farthest back (like Cascades = 50-ft), wants visibility to not be houses (or 250), setting limitations on location, facia all the same or similar, design conforming to T-C, parking lot in side/back loading dock, doesn't want to see the commercial side in front.
- ♦ Could make it retail/commercial w/apartments upstairs; likes idea of retail strip on Tallmadge Road, doesn't want to see businesses mixed with housing but apartment complex is okay mixed with commercial.
- ♦ Discusses T-C district regarding single family houses, newest builder/conversions are retail and rental on second floor. Deletion consensus of 'single family detached'. Option could be changing 4 dwelling per acre to higher density.
- ♦ Option could read with all new construction platted in the T-C district shall have a minimum setback as determined by the Board of Zoning Appeals. With shall be mixed-use

## BRIMFIELD TOWNSHIP ZONING COMMISSION

with retail and commercial in the front half; stores on bottom, combination of apartments on top.

- ♦ Doesn't want to see high density multi-family like on Sanctuary View Dr; would look like crap in T-C. Some are good, some are bad mixed-use is the only way to attract commercial traffic. Option to name something in permitted use, remove residential use, replace with mixed-use percentages. Ex. single family detached housing permitted use if used as 50% residential, 50% retail or combination. Doesn't want tall apartments, require mixed-use, no big box, similar strip setting on Tallmadge Road like far side of Cascades.
- ♦ Mentions that the new trend is retail strip with second floor housing making all the other needs in walking distance. Neighborhood communities, like retirement villages in Florida, mixed-use with consolidated housing. Classic subdivision of last 20-30 is changing back to the grid, open space into retail with parks, playgrounds, shopping surrounding with grid like traffic controls, etc.; compact neighborhood. If the goal is to have retail/commercial on frontage as citizen committee mentioned, that township has to be able to support/buyers for the businesses to be successful; doesn't believe population would support the frontage strip because majority from interstate are turning left to Cascades making the strip having to offer something very unique to make them turn right. High density apartments would have to support/utilize the desired strip is retail/commercial on Tallmadge Road. Ideal business plan. Different than Brimfield Plaza strip. Something the Board doesn't want to see an example of is on Commerce Drive and Route 91: to close together housing, roads a mess.
- ♦ Mentions that the golf course would have been the hub for the rest of the town center development.
- ♦ Confirms consensus on deleting single family – deleting under Section D a,b,c... Making it or other housing a variance going to Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA) in future. Also: wants to make front setback a negotiation piece, 100-ft setback, commercial frontage, apartments in back
- ♦ States B.1.d. Mixed-use facilities containing any combination entering a percentage there; conditionally permitted use, use existing wording with new percentage under permitted uses. Setbacks could be changed but developer/property owner will design their vision with the Board making valuable suggestions on the retail/commercial frontage area; Cascades' setback with the BZA negotiating the desired frontage on Tallmadge Road.
- ♦ Reviews the process of site plans: Zoning Department, Regional Planning (all subdivisions), platted, then BZA for conditional permits; bonus density allows BZA negotiation all the setback, current setback being 50-ft. Would like to see trees, park benches, gas lights through there. Asked if parking lot could be in the setback or is just green space, confirming just green space like Applebee's with parking lot starts at the setback. If conditionally permitted BZA can set the standards as in the architectural review. Clarification of letter d in permitted uses – non-residential use, not clearly written if referring to second story rental first floor retail/commercial.
- ♦ Explains the thinking of a developer: ground for cheap, mass produce and walk away with biggest profit; doesn't care what goes in, going to calculate the maximum profit possible and jam it full. Confirms developer would have to submit to BZA. Board confirms their main ideal development: remove all the single-family, 100-foot setback and mixed-use, apartments in the rear, and change to a good density.
- ♦ Confirms the Purpose edits of 'encourage' to shall with letter d being the key statement; which each purpose of the section is part of the Comprehensive Plan reflected in zoning book, zoning map and land use map.
- ♦ Dick believes simplest is to take golf course out of T-C, it is already split by the JEDDs. Determine the dwellings, density and go from there.
- ♦ Could negotiate for the clubhouse or similar to be used by them and community in exchange for more lots, like the walkable villages have.
- ♦ Board requests to review and next month send to Regional Planning, also would like to see plat/picture/overview of land for visualization. Dick states can get large print with two foot increments of topography, and soils.

### PUBLIC COMMENTS:

**Gretchen Crisp** – 3971 Selnik Road. Doesn't want to see housing there which people don't take care of, renters and then slumlords; they let things go which isn't good. Like to see businesses. Would rather see bigger homes because owners are happy, take great care, proud unlike renters that don't care like the trash which would be a mess.

BRIMFIELD TOWNSHIP ZONING COMMISSION

**Board** – Great point, reviewing the developments with multi-housing/apartments vs. landlords/developers are the same with pile up and not maintain. Blair -Trying do is to open it up for just 1000 square foot homes against each other. Lucky with Cascades as apartment complex has live-on manager is well maintained and only a little over average on rent.

**GOOD OF THE ORDER:**

**SET NEXT MEETING:**

**Thursday, July 13, 2017** at 7:00 PM is the next set regular scheduled meeting at the Brimfield Township Town Hall.

**MOTION #2017-22**

A motion was made by **Debbie Darlas** to adjourn the **June 8, 2017** at 8:30 PM, seconded by **William Kremer**. Motion passes unanimously.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman Ron Jones

\_\_\_\_\_  
Vice Chair Gary Rodd

\_\_\_\_\_  
Debbie Darlas

\_\_\_\_\_  
William Kremer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Tom Sargent

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary Wendi O’Neal

\_\_\_\_\_  
Alternate Thomas Johnson

\_\_\_\_\_  
Alternate Patrick Blair