

Mr. Cohen called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Present: Messrs: Metropulos, Sterling, Cohen and Shebeck

- Absent: Matt Bova

Also Present: Ms. Lynn Muter, City Planner

Mr. Brian Steele, Council Representative

The Board recited The Pledge of Allegiance.

<p>CITY OF TWINSBURG PLANNING COMMISSION WORK SESSION MARCH 4, 2019</p>
---

**1. Final Site Plan – Path Master – Building Addition and Parking Expansion**

1960 Midway Dr.

PP# 64-04038 I-2 Limited Industrial District

GARY VENCZEL/PATH MASTER

Mr. Gary Venczel 1596 Elizabeth Ln. Macedonia, Ohio, General Contractor representing Path Master presented the application.

- They are proposing a 40 foot by 120 foot office addition to the rear of the existing structure.

Mr. Cohen asked if the addition would result in new employees, the Planner's report stated that there are currently 4 parking spaces above the requirement and additional employees may change the requirement.

Mr. Venczel replied that there will not be additional employees.

Mr. Sterling asked if the addition impacts the rear setback in any way.

Mr. Michael Wohlwend with Wohlwend Engineering 4216 Karg Industrial Parkway also representing the applicant responded that the rear setback per code is 50 feet and with the proposed addition there are 155.1 feet so it sits well in excess of the requirement.

Ms. Muter noted that there is a driveway and parking lot connection to the adjacent property, which is legal non-conforming.

**2. Re-zoning – Northeast Corner of Glenwood Dr. and Darrow Rd.**

PP#'s 64-05379 & 64-08056

Requesting C-1, PUD and P-F to R-5 District

CITY OF TWINSBURG

Mr. Larry Finch, City of Twinsburg Director of Planning and Community Development presented the application.

- He handed out an updated document regarding rezoning the property to R-5.
- The City administration is recommending a rezoning of the property located at the northeast corner of Glenwood Dr. and Darrow Rd.
- This would be primarily because there is no identified purpose for the property, it is not generating any revenue to the city, uses for the area are limited to residential and commercial and the reason the city purchased the property was to prevent commercial uses from developing in that area so it would be inappropriate to use it commercially now.
- Mr. Finch referred to the first table at the back of the document:
  - The first table is an analysis of school enrollment and building permits issued for the last several years with the purpose of determining how many students would be contributed to the district from new units coming into the community, including all communities in the school district.
  - The school enrollment number is directly from the Twinsburg School District, the actual enrollment for those years.
  - They have estimated the total number of households or housing units and taken the hard data on the school enrollment and divided the students by the number of units, this gives you the number of students per household.
  - The numbers show a steady decline in students per household every year.
  - This is a trend that has been seen for the last two decades and, in addition to this trend, a survey was done with Twinsburg school bus drivers ten years ago, which he feels is still relevant, which

showed that the contribution of school age children from cluster units was substantially below the number of school age children contributed to the district from new housing development.

- Mr. Finch referred to the second table at the back of the document:
  - This property is 19.57 acres.
  - The R-5 district allows 3.5 units per acre.
  - Maximum number of units allowed would be 68.
  - The development value of that is over 18 million dollars.
  - The assessed value, at 35% is \$6,592,644.00
  - Property tax at the current millage would provide \$414,084.00 with \$319,259.00 going to the school district.
  - An estimated unit of 2,000 square feet, which is average, would have a market value of about \$275,000.00 and the total development value of \$18,836,125.00
  - The school district impact based on .4 per unit would be 27 students.
  - The annual state contribution for those students would be \$38,111.00, when you add in the tax revenue for the school district you have 357,369.00 annually; the per-student annual cost for the 27 students would be \$312,036.00.
  - There is a small surplus of funds for the expected impact of this rezoning on the school district.
  - There is also income tax generated by new residents; based on the 2017 household income reported to be \$75,365.00 at the current rate of 2% these new households would contribute \$102,500.00 annually to the City in income tax.
  - This property lies within existing infrastructure and would only add a small street or two that would need road plowing and minor maintenance.

Mr. Finch explained that he feels that there are advantages to this rezoning; it is property that the city does not have a use for and the city could use the money from the sale of it.

Mr. Sterling asked if there was an analysis done regarding re-zoning the property to commercial.

Mr. Finch replied that there was not because the land was originally purchased in order to prevent commercial development on that corner; it would sell for more as commercial land but the neighbors would not want that.

Mr. Sterling noted that he likes the idea of increased revenue to the school district due to no additional students being added to the district; he feels that it is already a commercial area.

Mr. Finch explained that the city was in court for two years because the owner of Corbett's Farm wanted to place commercial uses on the front of that property.

- This property is surrounded on three sides by residential; those neighbors do not want commercial uses in their back yard.

Mr. Metropulos asked if specific adjustments were made on the report regarding potential retirement or out-of-City income.

Mr. Finch stated that this is a quick-look estimate of the impact on the city; it did not break down further.

Mr. Metropulos noted that in the most recent Comprehensive Plan that area is scheduled to be a mixed use development.

- Things change and there may be a new plan for that area, is there a reason to move forward on this before a new Comprehensive Plan committee has a chance to review it?

Mr. Finch stated that that the Comprehensive Plan Committee has not been established yet, that will be a late-year activity; the goal is to update the document every five years and it was updated in 2014 so the next update will begin in 2019 and will likely take a year to complete.

- This has a higher priority than waiting for that period of time.

Mr. Metropulos stated that he is in favor of a mixed use district in that area.

Mr. Cohen commented that he understands the idea of mixed use but is concerned with finding tenants who would want to go into a commercial use at that location; there are other desirable areas and he is concerned that they may not find appropriate tenants for the area.

- He is not opposed to residential in that location, there is a lot of residential in the area it is convenient with the light commercial that is in the neighborhood.

Mr. Sterling remarked that the downtown area may redevelop faster if the land were vacant, this area may be a good fit for mixed use; there is not a lot of commercial over there at this time.

Mr. Cohen asked if anyone has approached the City regarding that land; residential or commercial developers?

Mr. Finch replied yes to both.

Mr. Steele pointed out that the document from Mr. Finch noted that Council recommended that it be zoned in the R-5 district, he suggested that prior to taking action the Commissioners come to City Council and receive direction from them.

Mr. Cohen replied that Planning Commission makes their recommendation to Council and they make the final decision.

- It does help to have discussion with the Council representative to Planning Commission at these meetings.

Mr. Steele asked if there will be a motion made tonight.

Mr. Cohen replied that based on the conversation tonight, he feels that they are not ready to decide on the application and is inclined to table it to the next meeting.

Mr. Steele explained that he will discuss it at the next City Council meeting and attend the next Planning Commission meeting with feedback from Council.

Mr. Sterling asked if Mr. Finch would supply a similar report using commercial information.

Mr. Finch pointed out that anything he does regarding a mixed use development, done under the C-5 district regulations, is purely conjecture.

- It would work out for the City financially, but to attach accurate numbers would be difficult.
- He could create a range of value for a commercial sale but here are several variables.

Ms. Muter noted that this property has gone to the ballot for rezoning twice, the first time as PUD which would have allowed for mixed use; so we have failed at the ballot twice with two different scenarios and as Mr. Metropulos said, things change.

- There is a percentage of people who will remember that the property was purchased so that no commercial development could occur at that location and that sets up for a bad outcome.

Mr. Finch commented that whatever the outcome of this is must be something that works for the community, both Planning Commission and City Council; the third time at the ballot has to be something that everyone feels supportive of.

- He will do what he can to accommodate the needs of the Commission and Council in that regard but there is a time constraint to get it on the November ballot.

Mr. Cohen stated that prior to the next meeting if there is any information the Commissioners would like to see from the City Planners, they can email Larry or Lynn to request that and also Mr. Steele will return to the next meeting with feedback from City Council.

*Mr. Cohen asked Ms. Muter if they could move her presentation to the regular meeting in order to allow the Path Master applicant to complete their portion of the meeting first.*

*Ms. Muter agreed.*

*Mr. Cohen closed the work session at 7:38*

3. **Draft** - Amendment to the Streets, Utilities and Public Services Code, Chapter 909  
Small Cell Technology in the Right of Way  
LYNN MUTER, CITY PLANNER

CITY OF TWINSBURG  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
MARCH 4, 2019

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – February 4, 2019

**Amendment: The meeting adjourned at 8:48.**

The minutes of February 4, 2019 were accepted as amended.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION- NONE

1. **Final Site Plan** – Path Master – **Building Addition and Parking Expansion**

1960 Midway Dr.

PP# 64-04038 I-2 Limited Industrial District  
GARY VENCZEL/PATH MASTER

- PLANNER'S REPORT DATED 2/21/2019 ON FILE AND NOTED AS EXHIBIT A.

**MOTION:**

UPON RELIANCE UPON REPRESENTATIONS MADE BY THE APPLICANT AND THEIR REPRESENTATIVES ALONG WITH THE SUBMITTED SITE PLAN FOR THE BUILDING ADDITION AND PARKING EXPANSION AT PATH MASTER 1960 MIDWAY DRIVE PP# 64-04038 DATE STAMPED RECEIVED JANUARY 10, 2019 I MOVE FOR FINAL SITE PLAN APPROVAL WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITION:

1. FINAL ENGINEERING APPROVAL OF THE STORM WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN.

MR. COHEN MOVED MR. STERLING SECONDED, UPON ROLL CALL MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

2. **Re-zoning** – Northeast Corner of Glenwood Dr. and Darrow Rd.

PP#'s 64-05379 & 64-08056

Requesting C-1, PUD and P-F to R-5 District  
CITY OF TWINSBURG

- PLANNER'S REPORT DATED 2/21/2019 ON FILE AND NOTED AS EXHIBIT B.

**MOTION:**

TO TABLE THIS ITEM.

MR. STERLING MOVED MR. SHEBECK SECONDED, UPON ROLL CALL MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. **Draft** - Amendment to the Streets, Utilities and Public Services Code, Chapter 909

Small Cell Technology in the Right of Way  
LYNN MUTER, CITY PLANNER

Ms. Lynn Muter, City of Twinsburg Planner gave the presentation.

- This chapter primarily takes from the House bill; most of the regulations have been pre-determined by the State.
- There are a few parameters that the state has given municipalities control of and these parameters will be administratively reviewed to provide consent of facilities in the Public Right of Way.
- There will be design guidelines to consider at the next meeting which will help distinguish between the locations.
- The design guidelines will try to accommodate requests for poles in residential areas with requiring a metal pole that is painted black, similar to the existing street light poles as well as requiring underground accessory equipment where the existing utilities are also underground.
  - Also finding common areas within HOA owned properties to place a new pole, or on a collector or arterial street on the perimeter of a residential area.
- On a street such as Miktarian or Twin Hills Pkwy, there could be a requirement to match the fluted, decorative light poles in those locations as well as having the accessory equipment underground.
  - This may not work in all locations, but it is a starting point.
- The State does allow for reserved space, if there is a planned facility such as the newly adopted trail plan or the roadway expansion on Darrow Rd., the City can deny pole locations in those areas.
- There is not much review authority given to the municipality, there is only 100 feet of room to move a pole.
- The state has exempted electric poles from this so there will not be collocation on electric poles and around 80% of poles in Twinsburg are electric poles.

- The focus should be on the design guidelines and how they can be used to make this the least impactful on the residential neighborhoods.

Mr. Cohen asked if the information given to the Commissioners was all from the House Bill.

Ms. Muter replied that it is not the exact Bill but all of the information in some format comes from that Bill.

Mr. Cohen pointed out that if there are any duplicate definitions between the Bill and the Twinsburg Codified Ordinances, there will have to be a stipulation in the chapter stating that the definitions in this chapter pertain only to this chapter and in the definitions section it will have to state that the definitions pertain to this unless noted otherwise.

Mr. Cohen asked what happens if these poles are placed in the downtown area and as the development begins a curb cut is required where a pole is located.

Ms. Muter replied that the pole would be relocated at the pole owner's cost.

Mr. Cohen asked if the design guidelines would involve the Architectural Review Board.

Ms. Muter noted that she had considered that and determined that there is not much to involve them with, there is so little actual design being decided; the most likely result will be mimicking the existing light poles.

Mr. Metropulos referred to chapter 909.12(b) it states that they have 30 days to repair a damaged facility, which seems like a lot of time.

Ms. Muter replied that she will look into that and let him know if that is correct.

**COMMUNICATIONS AND MISCELLANEOUS –**

Mr. Metropulos asked if Good Shepherd Church would be returning to Planning Commission soon.

Ms. Muter replied that they are expected to be on the agenda later in March.

Mr. Metropulos remarked that he would like the Commissioners to examine the Zoning Code pyramid.

Ms. Muter mentioned that the next agenda will have the final site plan for Circle K as well as likely returning cell technology in the right of way and rezoning request.

The rezoning will have to be on a Council agenda by the end of April to make the November ballot.

Mr. Cohen mentioned that he will not be at the April 1<sup>st</sup> meeting.

**EXCUSE ABSENT MEMBERS-** Mr. Bova

**MOTION:** TO EXCUSE MR. BOVA FROM THE MEETING.

MR. SHEBECK MOVED, MR. STERLING SECONDED, UPON ROLL CALL MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting unanimously adjourned at 8:08 p.m.

---

Mr. Cohen, Chairman

---

Cynthia Bennardo, Secretary