

LAFAYETTE TOWNSHIP ZONING COMMISSION  
Workshop  
6776 Wedgewood Road, Medina, Ohio  
April 21, 2010 @ 7:00 p.m.

Chair Karen Schoonover called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Roll call indicated five members of the Zoning Commission were present: Karen Schoonover, Russ Green, Sherri Meinke, Matt Strehle and Dianne Wenslow (alternate). Also present were Mike Biskup and Trustee Lynda Bowers (at 7:10 p.m.).

Trustee Bowers provided each member of the Board with a copy of the Ohio Sunshine Law booklet. She further indicated that the Board of Trustees had approved the copying of the Ohio Township Zoning Sourcebook issued by Miami University and this will also be distributed to all zoning board members.

**Workshop Discussion**

Chair Schoonover brought before discussion a recent e-mail from one of the trustees relative to the comprehensive plan. Those questions were:

- 1) Are you comfortable with the plan as it stands right now?  
Consensus of Board response: We are comfortable with the majority of it but there are still some things that need to be done. We have some issues with the Land Use that need to be resolved but basically as a whole the plan is a viable one. Some basic housekeeping things need to be done.
- 2) How much more needs to be done with the plan before you consider it to be finished?  
Consensus of Board response: Again, the basic housekeeping things need to be done as well as the issues with the Land Use.
- 3) Do you feel this plan provides a solid basis for the township to draft effective language in its zoning resolution? If there are any concerns in this regard, what would it take to resolve them?  
Consensus of Board response: That is why we sent the implementation part of the plan to the Prosecutor's Office to be reviewed. We want a little bit more directive on what should be included. Some parts sound like they (MCDPS) are directing us as to exactly what they want us to do. The plan does provide a basis for us to guide effective language but it is not the role of the Zoning Commission to draft the language. The Zoning Commission should not be charged with drafting the language – that would be the responsibility of an entity whose job is familiar with that aspect. Suggest using wording such as “encourage” or “consider” rather than “create” or “establish” as that allows us some leeway.
- 4) What can the Board of Trustees do to help this process at this time?  
Consensus of Board response: Once we have all the issues and housekeeping things written down, the trustee liaison and the Board chair should meet with MCDPS to resolve the problems.

Chair Schoonover indicated that she had started a list of housekeeping things and some other items and this list will be added to tonight and then forwarded to the Board. Any Board member having additional items to be shown on this list needs to forward the same to her immediately so there is one final list when the meeting with MCDPS takes place.

Some general discussion items include:

- How much acreage do we have in the township? It shows different acreage in places. For example, on p. 10, under Population, that population figure includes the Chippewa Lake Village. It's alright to include that figure but it should be noted as such – includes population figures from Chippewa Lake Village within the boundary of Lafayette Township. (Note: numbers were pulled from the Census Bureau.)
- Lion's Park, on p. 28 – Lion's Park is in the township and owned by Lafayette Township. The drive/road going into the park is a private drive but the township has an easement for access to the park.

Discussion items on the Land Use Plan/Map include:

- One of the things on the Land Use Plan is the "Lake Road Corridor Study" – that is not a land use – it needs to be removed.
- We need to add "PUD" after the areas designated as Golf Community and Chippewa Landing – and use the correct designation for both of them.
- The Land Use Map should follow along with the current use map and can be more general in nature. The key is to be able to distinguish between potentially long-term future land use and the reality of current and short-term land use. Delineating different zones is on the official zoning map. Any time you put a future use on a map without some conditions being met, you leave yourself open to some developer claiming that's what the community really wants. Plan for what you think will actually be able to happen within the next 5-10 years, then review it again at that time to see if land use needs to be zoned differently. You should put in the future land use map the areas that the township is considering changing like the areas around the borders and the part of Lake Road that should be changed.
- The terminology "Centers of Commerce" came from the original draft prepared by Bob Arnold.
- Development/Growth, p. 33, item 5 identifies four potential activity areas:
  - (a) The US 42 & SR 162 east intersection. (Note: commercial is shown in the orange color.) After discussion, rewrite the 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence to read: The area includes US 42 from the Westfield Road intersection north to the Route 162 west intersection; and along Route 162 east the area includes from the intersection of US 42 east to the west side of Ballash Road. (Note: the

problem was that this doesn't even encompass what we currently have and we want the whole area colored orange.) This was the 1<sup>st</sup> Center of Commerce noted. We are okay with the town center in addition to our commercial area. We are saying this circle here would be higher density residential because we are thinking it's some place where you are going to draw people and there will be stores as well as living areas – a mixed use. It was agreed to kind of square it off and the higher density would overlay part of our current commercial area.

- (b) The existing University/Technology Park. This is the 2<sup>nd</sup> Center of Commerce noted but there's no COC on this map, it should correlate with this map and the terminology isn't matching. It was agreed to leave this corner as it is and we're not making any changes except it is a PUD and should be noted as such. This area could be higher density. (Question, change to commercial on future use map? Discussion was unclear.)
- (c) The Chippewa Lake Amusement Park property along Lake Road (the Chippewa Landing project). The area along Lake Road surrounding this property would be included in the target area. Where is this starting? It needs to delineate our current commercial area. The descriptions that you are reading in here should be clear enough that anyone walking in off the street could pick that up and look at a map and know what it means.

The CRA (Community Reinvestment Area) shown on the land use map denotes an area that is targeted for development and redevelopment (commercial and residential). It is actually current land use but does it need to be shown on our future land use. Future land use should include uses that are not likely to change. The CRA district is commercial even though within the commercial area are existing grandfathered residential homes. Make the CRA area as an outline.

Pedestrian friendly commercial development – You could indicate that the community envisions pedestrian friendly commercial development. One could envision little shops and things like that which people would be walking to. Commercial development along SR 42 might be different than along Lake Road with the number of trucks, deliveries, parking, etc. The goal of a comp plan is to guide what we would want to happen in that location.

- (d) The Lake Road and Chippewa Road intersection. That is currently in commercial but nowhere on this future land use map does it have commercial listed – commercial should be shown on our future land use map. The future land use is going to anticipate what the current use is so commercial and residential as well needs to be shown.
- There was discussion relative to protecting the borders of Lafayette Township from future annexation (Montville Township, York Township and/or Medina City). Annexations are initiated by the property owners and what would be

the incentive for those property owners to annex; your zoning needs to take that incentive away. Their incentive might be pursuing water but the cost of the city income tax is a deterrent. Usually the reason why property owners get together to annex is financial but there's not enough land there to benefit for a high-density development.

- There was discussion about the border with Montville Township and what could happen if Medina City would annex that property. There was talk about a buffer zone of some sort. There is a flood flow problem along SR 162 bordering Montville. If you put high-density development on that property it might put it in a better position than now because developers would have to put in a detention pond and do everything else to stop the water from moving so it would be costly. We're looking at the north side of SR 162 where it meets Montville Township – from the NE corner of SR 162 and Ryan Road.
- There was discussion about showing Industrial on Lake Road but now it is residential from Medina City where you pick up in Lafayette Township because we don't have an industrial area in the township if we are changing that to commercial. Lake Road is industrial in Medina City coming up to SR 42. So we really don't have any industrial but at the same time we have the Tech Park, which is not built out. One of the things said in the comp plan is to encourage and work with the trustees to promote it. We need to review the plan in five years anyway and at that time if the Tech Park has become more populated with more industry that it can be reviewed.
- Bob Arnold's proposed study area was much more nebulous. It's not a defined line; it's kind of fuzzy. It was based on the Balanced Growth Initiative that all the townships had signed on to but it did show our commercial and residential. The current plan doesn't have any of our current zoning shown – like our Transitional district, our Medina City Buffer zone – those things need to be in the current use and also future use.
- Why is CRA listed twice? The CRA should just be an outline of the area. Add Institutional to the future land use, the PUDs should be added. The forest shouldn't be on there, it's not a land use. Communication tower is not a land use, it's an ancillary use for residential. (Note: For the text, anything that doesn't set up a future goal, we anticipate should stay the way it is.) Flood plain is not a land use – there's a separate map. Why isn't the other flood ways shown on the flood plain map? Remove the FEMA floodplain from future land use map.
- The proposed connector (part of the Medina County thoroughfare plan) is not a land use – remove. The multi-modal link is not a land use – remove. The rail trail is part of the park – so label goes away but the coloring is green.
- Medina-Lafayette joint jurisdiction is in red – it's okay.

- The town center area is going to be higher density in the text. The overlay will be mixed use (commercial and residential).
- Put on schedule for quick review in 18 months and a thorough review every 5 years. The comp plan should be as fluid as your zoning code. As trends start to change, your zoning has to change and your comp plan has to change.
- There was some discussion that the way it currently reads does not envision anything changing in zoning; that the future land use was almost identical to the current land uses. There was some concern it is not visionary enough. However, during the steering committee community meetings, the public said they liked things the way it was. This plan is conservative on our future land use map but we are going to do mixed use overlay and we're going to add additional density in; some of our development areas are not built out yet. At the time something is presented to us we will be re-looking at this. It will be reviewed. It's a guide for what the public said they liked for this area. (Note: the maps from the open house will be picked up from MCDPS for review to see if they match up with what we've got.)
- Map 9 needs to be redone. The 11 land uses agreed upon are: High Density Residential; Low Density Residential; Commercial; Agricultural; Industrial; Institutional; Parks & Recreation; Community Reinvestment Area (CRA); Medina County University Technology Park PUD district; Golf Community PUD overlay district; Chippewa Resort overlay district.

(Side Note: There is something off Chippewa Road currently showing as Industrial but it hasn't been used for some time – the old Chippewa Meat building. It was noted that someone is using that property now but the use is unknown. The Zoning Inspector could do an inspection to find out what's happening there but it might be better if the township police officer could stop in and do a security check and get updated information and have him look around. We need to determine what is going on at that location and document it and we would need to watch it for two years to determine its use. The burden of proof is on the township to prove when a use stopped and documentation is needed. It looks like it might be in residential but it needs to be checked. Suggestion is that it might be better as commercial. The current commercial is colored in orange; we'll leave that as it is.)

(Side Note: It might be a good idea to have a "Change of Use" permit in our township. This could be put in the zoning code.)

(Side Note: When redoing the zoning code you might want to designate a high density for commercial as well as residential. We currently don't require sidewalks and that's something that could be added to the zoning code as that would encourage pedestrian friendliness. You might also want to consider streetlights.)

(Side Note: When do the zoning text revision, look into having a commercial area 1000' or something like that or a distance off the road.)

(Side Note: For text, need to write Mixed Use and Agricultural Use)

It is anticipated that the Prosecutor's review of chapter 8, 9 and 10 would be received before the next meeting. Also at the next meeting it is hoped that a final list of issues can be completed, which includes changes to the Future Land Use map. After that the issues and corrections will be brought to the attention of MCDPS.

**Announcements**

The next regular meeting is Wednesday, May 5, 2010, at 7:00 p.m. at the township hall (date changed because use of township hall for election on Tuesday, May 4).

MCDPS Workshop on the topic of "How to be a Better Zoning Commissioner" is Tuesday, April 27, 2010, at 6:30 p.m. at the Medina County Library.

**Adjournment**

Upon motion by Karen Schoonover, duly seconded by Russ Green, it was unanimous that the meeting be adjourned. Meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Marlene L. Oiler, Certified PP, PLS  
Lafayette Township Zoning Commission Secretary

(Note: Minutes approved on 6/1/10.)