

Amended 4-2-2019

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. Scott Barr, Council Representative

Mayor Ted Yates

The Board recited The Pledge of Allegiance.

<p>CITY OF TWINSBURG PLANNING COMMISSION WORK SESSION MARCH 18, 2019</p>
--

1. **Final Site Plan** – Good Shepherd Church – **Building Addition**

9571 Shepard Rd.

PP# 64-03521 PF Public Facilities District

THOMAS ZISKA / RICH PEJEAU

Mr. Rich Pejeau 9637 Putnam Ct. Twinsburg, Ohio representing Good Shepherd Christian Church.

- They are seeking final site plan approval for a building addition.
- They have addressed the two outstanding items; storm water detention and parking.

Mr. Cohen commented that it does appear that the applicant has approval from the City Engineer as well as submission of the shared parking agreement.

Ms. Muter replied that from City Staff perspective, the application appears to be ready for final approval.

2. **Rezoning** – 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

Ms. Muter, City Planner presented the item which was tabled at the last meeting.

- There had been discussion regarding what best land use could be brought to the voters with Commercial, Mixed Residence/ Business District or the initial request of PUD, which has already failed at the polls and the second request in 2015 for R-5 residence district which also was not supported at the polls.
- This is a request to take it back to the voters as the R-5 district to allow for single family homes.
 - At our last meeting the Commission questioned City Council's support for commercial versus residential land uses.
- Mr. Larry Finch presented last meeting a fairly in-depth analysis regarding cost to the school district as a residential district and the Commission concurred that the property would be more valuable if sold as commercial property; it would have issues with access because of the round-about and staff feels that it would not be supported by voters because of the history with the property and the sense of the City purchasing it to take it off the market for commercial development.

Mayor Yates commented that the point is to place this back on the ballot, City Council decided to do this soon; they have a lot of requests for a particular product that Twinsburg does not have much of, the upscale single story condominium, townhome, cluster home type of living.

- The market in Twinsburg for condominiums is very active with people asking when this issue will return to the ballot to allow another opportunity for more of these to be developed.
- The City is looking at the revenue available from the sale of the property as well, but along with the best use of the property with R-5 being determined because it allows some flexibility in design and density.

Mr. Barr noted that he would prefer to see more of a fee-simple product there, but something like a 55 and older community would be great for the market in the area; it is a nice parcel with the opportunity to generate some revenue and offer residential options.

Mayor Yates added that he feels that homes on smaller lots would be good, whatever style they take, there are developers and builders who are interested; that could be a beautiful addition to the area and serve a need in offering that type of housing to existing residents desiring to stay in Twinsburg but needing smaller, one story living.

Mr. Cohen asked if anyone followed up with Ms. Muter or Mr. Finch as offered at the last meeting.

Ms. Muter replied that there have been no questions or comments from the Commissioners since that meeting.

Mr. Sterling pointed out that he has always preferred that property to be zoned commercial as it would bring in more revenue; his concern with the R-5 zoning is that Twinsburg is beginning to have an abundance of apartments and condominiums and that type of resident tends to vote against school levies; he would like to be sure that the school district stays strong.

Mayor Yates explained that he is not looking for a senior community, those put stress on school funding as well as safety forces; almost all of the new developments recently have been in an R-5 zoning district, it does allow a lot of flexibility in terms of density and layout.

- He feels that a lower density zoning district would not be the best use of the land and commercial would be too close to the residential area.

Mr. Sterling stated that only the north side would be residential against commercial.

- The sale price and tax base would be higher if it were zoned commercial.

Mr. Cohen agreed and pointed out that a commercial development puts its own stresses on the community.

Mayor Yates explained that he does not believe that this being developed R-5 would put stress on the school district; the district has been declining and most of the growth that exists is coming from outside of the City.

- The community is aging; many residents are becoming empty-nesters and staying in the city.

Mr. Shebeck noted that the property to the north of this is already condominiums so it is likely a good fit for the area.

- Commercial development may yield more revenue but is counterintuitive to what is planned for the center of town; there can only be so much commercial.
- The demand for maintenance-free detached living is increasing as people want independent walls with the convenience of a condominium.

- The voters ultimately get to decide.

Mr. Metropulos commented that the Comprehensive Plan has this area designated a Mixed Use.

- He supports a small mixed use commercial area with very limited businesses.
- He does not care for the small R-5 lots but he could approve with mixed uses.
- The Comprehensive Plan calls for it and that is what he is going by.

Mr. Cohen stated that he feels that R-5 zoning is an appropriate fit for the land, it fits with and compliments what is surrounding it; he also agrees that it should not be designated as 55 or older or senior housing, it should be open to anyone.

- He does not see it being a detriment to the school system and if people with no children move in there, he hopes that they realize that schools influence property values and should be supported.
- He agrees that with the C-5 commercial development being focused downtown there would be conflict between these two areas as there is not enough support for so much commercial although he understands that the revenue would likely be higher with a commercial property.

Mr. Sterling explained that he does not expect a conflict between the two areas as the city does not own any of the land in the downtown district and, with many owners, that development can take many years to be completed; this area could be sold and developed all at once very quickly.

3. **Draft** - Streets, Utilities and Public Services Code Chapter 910
 Small Cell Design Guidelines
 LYNN MUTER / CITY OF TWINSBURG

Mr. Cohen moved this presentation to the regular meeting and adjourned the work session at 7:25pm.

CITY OF TWINSBURG PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MARCH 18, 2019
--

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – March 4, 2019

The minutes of March 4, 2019 were accepted as submitted.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION- NONE

1. **Final Site Plan** – Good Shepherd Church – **Building Addition**
 9571 Shepard Rd.
 PP# 64-03521 PF Public Facilities District
 THOMAS ZISKA / RICH PEJEAU

- 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 AT THE GOOD SHEPHERD CHRISTIAN CHURCH 9571 SHEPARD ROAD, PP#64-03521 DATE STAMPED RECEIVED MARCH 11, 2019 I MOVE FOR FINAL SITE PLAN APPROVAL.

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

2. **Rezoning** – 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. Metropulos commented that Mr. Finch provided a lot of financial information and he was very optimistic. Mr. Metropulos ran his own numbers and was more optimistic and was unable to show a revenue gain.

- He feels that a small, 2 acre commercial area it would not inhibit what is being done downtown.

Mr. Cohen asked if it is zoned C-5, how does the City limit what percentage is developed commercial?

Mr. Metropulos explained that he has seen similar areas.

Ms. Muter explained that they would have to go back to the original request for PUD zoning and then create those separate areas.

Mayor Yates pointed out that there are three brand new commercial units, which are currently empty, just up the street on the corner of Glenwood Dr. and Liberty Rd.; the two corner parcels at Chamberlin Rd. and E. Aurora Rd. have been marketed as commercial for years and one is now rezoned R-5 with the other having attempted the same.

- He is a proponent of mixed use but in today's market it has to be the right location.

MOTION: UPON RELIANCE UPON REPRESENTATIONS MADE BY THE APPLICANT ALONG WITH THE SUBMITTED APPLICATION FOR REZONING FROM THE CITY OF TWINSBURG FOR 2605 GLENWOOD DRIVE, PP#64-05379 AND 10135 DARROW ROAD, PP#64-08056 DATED FEBRUARY 13, 2019 AND UPDATED MARCH 4, 2019, I RECOMMEND THAT PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMEND TO CITY COUNCIL THE REZONING REQUEST FROM PUD PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT, PF PUBLIC FACILITIES DISTRICT AND C-1 LOCAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT TO THE R-5 SINGLE FAMILY CLUSTER DISTRICT.

MR. COHEN MOVED, MR. SHEBECK SECONDED, UPON ROLL CALL MOTION TIED 2-2 WITH MESSRS. STERLING AND METROPULOS DISSENTING.

- REZONING WILL GO TO CITY COUNCIL WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION FROM PLANNING COMMISSION.

3. **Draft** - Streets, Utilities and Public Services Code Chapter 910
Small Cell Design Guidelines
LYNN MUTER / CITY OF TWINSBURG

Ms. Lynn Muter, City Planner presented the draft of Code Chapter 910.

- She has researched design guidelines of many other communities who have created them within the parameters allowed through the House Bill.
- 910.09 Specifications for new wireless support structures is where the bulk of the regulations are; it is broken down to locations in residential districts, locations in business and industrial districts and locations in C-5 mixed residence business district and then locations within parkways, which is mostly to address poles placed on Miktarian Pkwy. or Twin Hills Pkwy.
- In the residential district with underground utilities, there is the ability to have stricter standards for design guidelines; the height limit has to be 35 feet and there can be no utility poles that are higher than 35 feet anywhere within 300 feet of the underground utility area; that is specified in the House Bill.
 - That gives very specific guidelines in item (b) Design in Residential Districts (4).
 - If you are going to require the smaller height limitation of the pole structure in the underground areas, you have to agree to allow replacement of existing poles in that area, that is also part of the House Bill.
 - In residential areas where there are no utility poles, only the tapered black light pole with the colonial light on it, that pole will not support the accessory facilities that go along with these units; the light poles are not likely to be replaced but we will probably have to allow a pole to be placed in this area and the question is what do we prefer to have, the accessory boxes in an above ground cabinet or on the pole.
- We have the ACD Net pole on Ravenna Rd. which is a grey steel pole and is not painted, the grey blends in with our weather in Northeast Ohio but the cabinetry on the side of the pole is very visible.
 - In underground utility areas we can try to get the accessory structures in an underground vault, this may not work in all locations but it is a starting point; in the C-5 district the starting point is to collocate on an existing pole and locate accessory structures underground.
 - In a residential area, is it more preferable to see a cabinet on the ground or to see equipment side-mounted on a pole?

Mr. Sterling asked if this equipment can be located within existing cabinets.

Ms. Muter replied that there is a 100 foot of margin to move a pole from the providers desired location, this may allow cabinets to be placed in less obvious locations or areas that can require landscaping.

Mr. Sterling noted that all telephone boxes are at sidewalk level, would this equipment be able to go inside those boxes?

Mr. Cohen replied that the cell providers will want their own boxes in order to limit access to the equipment to their employees only.

Mr. Cohen pointed out that equipment on a pole is very visible; a ground cabinet with landscaping would be less noticeable.

Ms. Muter clarified that, where underground equipment is not possible, the Commission prefers ground cabinets to pole-mounted equipment; and that a tapered metal pole painted black to match the existing light poles are also their preference.

Mr. Cohen agreed.

Ms. Muter explained that she needs a definition for Parkways, such as Twin Hills or Miktarian; the standards there will be fluted metal poles painted black with equipment in an underground vault.

Mr. Cohen agreed.

Ms. Muter proceeded with the R-5 district; the standard being to collocate on a traffic signal mast or an existing pole.

- The commercial and industrial districts will require a metal pole on a side lot line and pole mounted equipment.
 - Some commercial areas with underground utilities would have ground cabinets.

Mr. Cohen stated that he always prefers ground equipment to pole-mounted as long as there is landscaping.

Ms. Muter asked what if there is a cabinet between the curb and sidewalk where there would not be landscaping.

Mr. Cohen replied that he would still prefer ground equipment and asked about the paintings which have been done on several existing cabinets in town.

Ms. Muter stated that the guidelines can allow the city to choose the colors of the cabinets; we could ask if artwork would be allowed.

Ms. Muter thanked the Commissioners for their input on the design guidelines.

Ms. Muter told Mr. Metropulos that she took his question regarding the 30 day period to allow repairs to damaged cell structures to the City Engineer; they decided that if it is in a public right of way, the city will remove the pole and let the provider know that their facility is down but she feels that they will already know and will want to get it fixed and back on-line as soon as possible.

Mr. Metropulos asked about 910.02(d) which addresses facilities being maintained in good, safe condition, who will be inspecting these facilities?

Ms. Muter replied that this refers to something being obviously broken or in need of maintenance; the provider would be required to fix it.

Mr. Metropulos referred to 910.09(f)(2) and asked if the structures in this section are only poles or boxes as well.

Ms. Muter replied that it is referring to the poles, the support structures.

Mr. Cohen is concerned that the term technically feasible may leave too much area for interpretation.

- Will this be reviewed by the City Law Director in order to see if he finds anything that may have been missed?

Ms. Muter explained that he received copies of each draft as she has created the different versions; she would like to share new updates with Planning Commission and the Law Director as she continues forward and have small email input regarding some changes in order to move things along better and begin the process of sending it to City Council in April.

Ms. Muter stated that with this being the starting place and small changes still being needed, she will email changes to the group for the purpose of receiving feedback to create a final draft and moving it to Council in April.

COMMUNICATIONS AND MISCELLANEOUS –

Ms. Muter noted that there will be a final site plan as well as the lot split and consolidation for Circle K at the April 1st meeting; they are working on their grading plan and resolving the lighting deficiencies to prepare for that meeting.

- There may be enough light spilling over from Burger King but they did not have time to determine that and submit a photometric before tonight's meeting.
- There is an 8,000 gallon above ground storage tank behind the building which holds DEF, a non-hazardous substance, which is not regulated by the EPA and there is no spill protocol or concerns with it.
 - The site plan reflects an above ground storage tank; originally they were going to remove the existing underground diesel tanks and place this tank in that space but they do not have to so they have opted to place this tank above ground behind the building.

Mr. Cohen pointed out that DEF fluid degrades once the humidity in the air is introduced; most diesel DEF tanks are 5 gallons with DEF typically sold in 2.5 gallon containers so that the entire container is used at once and not stored, allowing it to degrade.

Mr. Cohen noted that April 1st begins the next term for Planning Commission and the new member will be present; typically this would be the meeting at which Chairman and Vice Chairman would be chosen.

- Mr. Cohen will not be at the April 1st meeting and is interested in continuing to Chair the Commission; he supports the Commissioners' decision whether to vote on that at the April 1st meeting or to wait for the April 15th meeting, which he can attend.

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 7:55 p.m.

Mr. Cohen, Chairman

Cynthia Bennardo, Secretary