

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

BEFORE THE BOARD OF ZONING COMMISSION

JACKSON TOWNSHIP, OHIO

AMENDMENT NO. 646-20

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

The following Board of Zoning Commission
Hearing was taken before me, the undersigned, Deanna
Gleckler, a Registered Professional Reporter, Certified
Realtime Reporter and Notary Public in and for the State
of Ohio, at the Jackson High School Auditorium, Jackson
Township, Ohio, on Thursday, the 29th day of October
2020, at 5:00 p.m.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

APPEARANCES :

BOARD OF ZONING COMMISSION

JAMES CONLEY - CHAIRMAN

CHYLECE HEAD

JOHN WESTON

RICH COSGROVE - ALTERNATE

JUSTIN GANTZ - ALTERNATE

JONI POINDEXTER - ZONING INSPECTOR

- - - - -

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. CONLEY: Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Jim Conley. I'm chair of the Jackson Township Zoning Commission and we're calling to order a meeting of the Jackson Township Zoning Commission. The meeting is called to order. The purpose of this evening's meeting is to discuss and vote on amendment number 646-20, which is a request to rezone from RR rural residential district to R-3 residential planned unit development district approximately 17.32 acres consisting of parcel numbers 1620887, 1623024, 1602287 and 1602286, located on the south side of Stuhldreher, approximately 720 feet east of Ocala, N.W., section 33 N.E., Jackson Township.

The process of this evening's meeting will be to hear first from the person requesting the rezone, followed by anyone who wishes to speak in favor of the rezone. At that point we will ask anyone who is opposed to the rezone to come up and tell us their feelings about that. Once everyone has had an opportunity to speak, we will close the meeting to public comments. The commission will then discuss and vote on the proposal. When you

1 come up, if you would please tell us your name and
2 where you live. Would the applicant please get us
3 started.

4 MR. RICHINS: Good evening. I'm Reed
5 Richins, Architect, representing Dwight Yoder
6 Builders, Dwight Yoder, the proponent for our
7 application this evening. As the chairman stated,
8 we are requesting a rezone of 17 approximate .32
9 acres from its present zoning of RR rural
10 residential to R-3 PUD. Our purpose is to
11 construct a total of 69 three and two bedroom, two
12 bath condominiums. All individual homes will be
13 single floor in design and is ranch style, and
14 range in size from 1726 square feet to 1818 square
15 feet. We're proposing, as you will see, to
16 construct the 69 units within a configuration of 24
17 duplex buildings and seven triplex buildings. We
18 project that sales prices based on current dollars
19 will range from just above 300,000 to up to
20 350,000, depending on features such as basements
21 and sunrooms. Also I'll add that although this
22 will not be an age restricted community, we expect
23 that many, if not most of the residents, will be
24 empty-nest couples downsizing from their current
25 home.

1 So what I'd like to do is trace the
2 approval basis that we see for this project for the
3 commission to consider. Also note at the outset
4 that a week ago we held an information meeting in
5 this building for all the adjacent property owners,
6 and I trust that at that meeting all the
7 outstanding questions were answered. We stayed
8 until there weren't any further questions and
9 people seemed satisfied. I'll also note that with
10 this proposal, we're not asking for any variances
11 or concessions or special conditions from the
12 township. In fact, we will show that we are, what
13 we're proposing doesn't even approach full
14 utilization of the proposed zoning classification.
15 So we see this as a straight-up proposal compliant
16 fully with the stated intent and requirements of
17 the township comprehensive plan, the zoning
18 resolution and all particulars of the R-3 PUD
19 district.

20 So, again, I would like to provide a basis
21 for the, what we see as the approval path for this
22 rezoning proposal, beginning with the comprehensive
23 plan. The comprehensive plan recognizes that
24 growth and development are inevitable in the
25 township and in fact desirable, and it also

1 acknowledges the right of property owners to
2 develop his or her land, but the comprehensive plan
3 exists and seeks to guide that development along
4 lines within parameters that meet the township
5 vision and goals as established in the
6 comprehensive plan. Now, these goals include
7 pacing residential development that we're talking
8 about here tonight with the ability to provide
9 roads, schools and other public services, to
10 minimize the loss of open space, to encourage high
11 quality residential design and landscaping, to
12 provide diverse housing options for various ages
13 and incomes, and to preserve the integrity of
14 existing neighborhoods. To accomplish these goals,
15 the comprehensive plan favors open space site
16 design, transitional zoning techniques and planned
17 unit development.

18 The guidance that's contained in the
19 comprehensive plan, we understand, has legal weight
20 as a basis for this commission, the zoning
21 commission, as well as the trustees in their land
22 use decisions, and certainly the comprehensive plan
23 must guide developer proposals such as the one
24 we're putting forward. The comprehensive plan
25 earmarks future development areas of the township

1 for the general categories of residential,
2 commercial, high tech and industrial and so on.
3 With application to this proposal, future
4 residential land use is further broken down into
5 rural residential and residential, distinguishing
6 residential as being more dense than rural
7 residential and preferring for the residential
8 areas detached and attached single family
9 residences, two-family residences and multifamily
10 residences.

11 Now, as we see in the future land use map,
12 here's the site right here, this is in the
13 comprehensive plan, and in this blow-up from the
14 same map, the site we're looking at is earmarked in
15 the comprehensive plan - I'll back up one just for
16 reference - it's earmarked for residential use as
17 proposed or distinguished from rural residential
18 development. While some nearby areas are still
19 intended to remain as rural residential, backing up
20 again, we can see that those areas also connect
21 with other areas of open space, rural residential
22 and farm land, but this site is not slated to
23 remain rural residential. It was foreseen at the
24 time the comprehensive plan was prepared, not that
25 many years ago, that this site would be developed

1 in a more intensive use than rural residential.
2 The comprehensive plan instead sees this site as
3 suitable for more intensive uses such as the
4 attached or detached residential that we mentioned
5 earlier.

6 Now, comparing existing uses, comparing
7 existing uses, this is from Stark County GIS on the
8 left and from the comprehensive plan on the right,
9 comparing existing uses on the left with the future
10 land use map on the right, we see that in this
11 vicinity the existing and recently approved uses
12 establish a gradient from farm land and rural
13 residential to more intensive R-2, R-3 and R-4 uses
14 in this area, all except for this site. So the
15 zoning action we're proposing will fulfill the
16 intent of the comprehensive plan and complete a
17 desirable step in the transition of uses in the
18 vicinity.

19 Now, turning to zoning options for this
20 site, we have already seen that the comprehensive
21 plan encourages planned unit development and that
22 this site should be developed with something
23 between single family detached and multifamily in
24 density. It should also add to the range of
25 available housing options for various ages and

1 incomes.

2 Now from the zoning ordinance. The R-3 PUD
3 zoning classification, per the township zoning
4 resolution, allows attached or detached residences
5 and was created to support township goals, number
6 one, for a range of housing types and development
7 densities; two, as an alternative to apartment and
8 single family subdivisions without losing beauty or
9 livability; three, for traditional appearance and
10 design; and four, for promotion and protection of
11 open space.

12 The R-3 PUD allows a maximum of six
13 dwelling units per acre for attached single family
14 dwellings in buildings of a maximum of four
15 dwelling units per building and incidentally,
16 prohibits commercial uses. The zoning resolution
17 also allows R-3 PUD to occur, number one, between
18 residential and multifamily; or two, between
19 residential and commercial - nonapplicable here -;
20 number three, it must have access onto an arterial
21 collector or local street; and four, it must be
22 determined to be compatible with surrounding land
23 uses and appropriate for the area considered in the
24 context of an integrated development plan
25 consistent with the PUD concept.

1 Now, this site and the proposed development
2 clearly meet the location criteria, being a
3 position between existing multifamily and single
4 family residential developments and located on
5 Stuhldreher Street, which as we can see from this
6 map, here we are, and here's the key over here, and
7 zooming in for blow-up, you'll see that Stuhldreher
8 is designated a major collector. So it certainly
9 meets that qualification.

10 The determination of compatible and
11 appropriate, item number four here, is, as we
12 understand it, the determination is made in the
13 application of the review criteria that are
14 published in the zoning ordinance section 805.10.
15 That's these right here. I'd like to address
16 these, if it doesn't throw us off, in reverse
17 order, beginning with H. H requires that the
18 development conform to provisions of the township's
19 land use plan, that is the comprehensive plan. I
20 think we've already shown that it does comply in
21 all regards.

22 Item G, vehicular approaches must be
23 designed to avoid interference with traffic on
24 surrounding streets. Now, this is the layout plan
25 for the development. You'll see that the proposed

1 development connects with Stuhldreher opposite
2 Piperglen Avenue and it also connects with the
3 existing dead-end of Bermuda Street right here via
4 a gate equipped with a Knox lock. So it's intended
5 only as an emergency access point. The development
6 also connects to Stuhldreher with an emergency
7 vehicle only access drive here on the west side of
8 the site. Now, this, as you can see in the note, I
9 hope you can read it from your position, that's a
10 gravel drive and protected with a gate with a Knox
11 lock, preventing use except in emergency by
12 authorized equipment.

13 So the main entrance right here will
14 constitute, and this intersection will constitute
15 the main ingress and egress route for the
16 neighborhood, and the one on Bermuda Street would
17 be simply a secondary emergency route available.
18 The Stuhldreher intersection, which is a boulevard
19 style entrance aligning with Piperglen and meeting
20 Stuhldreher Street at 90 degrees, it's been
21 reviewed by Stark County Engineers office for turn
22 radii, overall configuration lane widths, boulevard
23 island setback and so forth, and was approved
24 without revision as meeting county engineers'
25 review criteria for intersection design.

1 The intersection was also examined by GBC
2 Design, our civil engineer on this project, for
3 available sight distances, that is the distance
4 from which an oncoming driver can see a vehicle
5 pulling out onto Stuhldreher Street from the new
6 proposed drawing. Their study found that sight
7 distances of 500 feet and 430 feet were available
8 from the east and west respectfully. Now, we
9 understand that these are considered to be very
10 generous distances for the traffic speeds on
11 Stuhldreher, even allowing for slight excess speed.
12 We have with us John Walsh, civil engineer, a
13 principal with GBC Design, who can answer any
14 additional questions on this point when we reach
15 that point.

16 Returning to the criteria. Letter F,
17 requiring that streets suitable and adequate for
18 anticipated traffic and increased densities that
19 will not overload the street network are provided.
20 I'll note that the interior streets have been
21 designed to county standards for private
22 residential streets. Now, the amount of traffic to
23 be added by the proposed depth was studied by TMS
24 Engineers, traffic engineers retained by the
25 developer, and they concluded that new trips during

1 critical weekday morning and afternoon peak hours
2 would total 38 and 48 trips respectively. Their
3 conclusions based on this data are highlighted
4 here, that the new traffic generated by the
5 development should not have an impact on the
6 surrounding street network, and that the
7 anticipated general volumes from the new
8 neighborhood will be less than daily variations in
9 the current volumes of traffic already occurring on
10 Stuhldreher and should not be perceived by the
11 traveling public. John Walsh can also respond to
12 any questions that you might have on this point.

13 So review criteria E, compliance with
14 state, county and township regulations. First we
15 have shown, I believe, compliance with township
16 zoning regulations and have initial Stark County
17 approval. We also recognize the development plan
18 review process and will submit a final development
19 plan for detailed review to verify compliance with
20 all township, county and state requirements for all
21 elements, including drainage, environmental
22 protection, phasing, site construction, and
23 building construction.

24 Additionally, condominium ownership and
25 management legal documents will be prepared and

1 recorded in compliance with Ohio law. These
2 documents will define private ownership areas,
3 common ownership areas, and establish an HOA and
4 specify procedures for transition from developer to
5 HOA control and management of the community.

6 The criteria D, the community must be able
7 to be serviced adequately by essential public
8 facilities and services, including highways and
9 streets, police and fire, drainage structures,
10 refuse disposal, and schools. We've already
11 addressed adequacy of the existing street system.
12 I'll note that we've met twice with township
13 services, including fire department, public works
14 and roads, zoning and administration. We very much
15 appreciate their input and found it valuable. We
16 believe that they will see reflected in this plan
17 the incorporation of their suggestions.

18 Further, we have obtained a letter from
19 Stark County Engineer verifying the ability of the
20 site to be serviced by sanitary sewer, and the
21 drainage engineer of Stark County has also reviewed
22 the site in person and agreed in concept with the
23 proposed storm water concept. So the initial
24 concepts for these systems, sanitary and storm
25 water, have already been worked out for the

1 proposed development, pending favorable
2 recommendation this evening.

3 Further, we have made contact with refuse
4 services and verified their ability to provide
5 curbside trash pickup, which will eliminate the
6 need for dumpsters and enclosures. We have had the
7 general development plan reviewed by regional
8 United States Postal Service personnel, who have
9 approved the community for pedestal type mailboxes
10 located for the convenience of residents and the
11 mail carrier. I'll just point those out. Pedestal
12 here, here, here and here.

13 So review criteria C, the development must
14 not be detrimental to property in the immediate
15 vicinity or to the community as a whole. With
16 respect to this, I'll note that with sales prices
17 projected in current dollars between 300 and
18 350,000 and architectural design commensurate with
19 that of adjacent single family neighborhoods, also
20 with bermed and evergreen planted buffers and with
21 professional and generous landscaping, we see this
22 proposed neighborhood as being far from
23 detrimental, but rather, a significant boost to the
24 immediate area. Also, this R-3 PUD zoned community
25 will provide the essential transitional density

1 that is presently missing in the gradient between
2 farm land and intensely developed areas; or more
3 specifically, between apartments and single family
4 detached residential. This is the intent of the
5 township's comprehensive plan and zoning code and
6 has the effect of protecting property values.

7 Also, with respect to the community as a
8 whole, the expected market segment of these homes,
9 that is, well-off empty-nester seniors, has been
10 shown by national studies by the NAHB and others to
11 strengthen the community in measurable and
12 immeasurable ways.

13 Criteria B, development must not be
14 hazardous, disturbing or producing adverse effects
15 on adjacent or surrounding uses or structures. I
16 think this has been largely addressed, but I will
17 add that drainage, street lighting, plantings and
18 so on will be examined in detail during the final
19 development plan review process. And I'll also
20 add, we'll see this on the site plan, that buffers
21 have been provided in generous setback areas more
22 than are required to buffer and provide privacy and
23 site privacy and individual character to the homes
24 that are already present on Stuhldreher. which
25 brings us to final criteria A, that the development

1 must be designed, constructed, operated and
2 maintained so as to be harmonious and appropriate
3 in appearance with the existing or intended
4 character of the general vicinity and not change
5 the essential character of the area. So I'm
6 presenting here a concept rendering of the proposed
7 elevations of the proposed two unit building, we'll
8 see the three unit subsequently here, and I'll
9 point out just a few things; that the front
10 elevation is detailed with a mix of materials that
11 are high quality materials, stone, fiber cement
12 siding, permanent poly-type trim, and it's detailed
13 with traditional eave detailing and gable
14 detailing. The garage doors themselves are well
15 detailed.

16 I'll also point out that though this is a
17 duplex attached single family building, it's not
18 symmetrical. Instead, it's a balance composition.
19 It will see a similar configuration with the
20 three-unit, this blow-up of the front elevation.
21 Returning to the overall view, I'll also point out
22 that the side elevations have detailing from the
23 front elevation that continues on around both
24 sides, to not neglect those views that will be seen
25 as a person approaches their own residence.

1 The plan, I will point out, will be
2 designed to Fair Housing Standards, even though
3 that would not be required for a two or a
4 three-unit building, but Fair Housing Standards we
5 are committed to, as they provide a level of
6 adaptable accessibility, which will allow residents
7 to age in place.

8 Taking a look at the three, the triplex
9 building, as I mentioned, you'll see that it's
10 composed asymmetrically and in a balanced
11 composition. Blow-up of that front elevation just
12 for reference.

13 Finally, one final point of criteria A,
14 having to do with the maintaining the character of
15 the general vicinity and of the public area, of
16 course, we'll defer to the commission to judge this
17 for themselves on the basis of all that we've
18 presented here this evening, but we note that with
19 professional civil design, professional landscaping
20 design, professional architectural design, coupled
21 with the multi-step township PUD review process, we
22 feel assured that this proposal provides the
23 township with the very best opportunity for a
24 harmonious and appropriate neighborhood that will
25 enhance the township as a whole.

1 Now, if I could just briefly touch on a few
2 final points. There are sometimes questions about
3 the supply and demand of peniel homes. Peniel home
4 in this case is intended to respond to a certain
5 market segment. It also responds to the
6 comprehensive plan and the zoning ordinance,
7 emphasis on providing a variety of housing options.
8 At our informational meeting last week we heard a
9 brief presentation from our, the broker/realtor on
10 this project, who provided macro data about the
11 actual extended need for this type of housing and
12 for housing units to serve this and other market
13 segments.

14 Additionally, we'll note that although
15 there are other peniel home projects in the
16 township, they're not on the same time line; and we
17 see this as coming into the market at a time that
18 will not overload the market with this type of
19 home. Also, although it's not reflected on this
20 preliminary plan, we anticipate phasing so that
21 dwelling units reach the market in a paced fashion
22 and can be provided to the market as the market is
23 ready.

24 Also, I would like to discuss briefly the
25 target market. I did mention that this is aimed at

1 empty-nester seniors. I think it would be helpful
2 to understand the demographics of this community.
3 As we stated earlier, although not an age
4 restricted, this neighborhood will be age targeted
5 for a senior population. The developer, Mr. Yoder,
6 has built similar senior-oriented aviel homes
7 elsewhere and has pretty deep experience with this
8 target demographic. It seems very likely that the
9 majority of the residents will meet this
10 demographic based on the product that we are
11 proposing. Now, based on this experience and on
12 empirical data, we see that the great majority of
13 the residents will most likely be retired,
14 financially stable seniors who have sold a larger
15 home in this general area, who can afford a nice
16 place and who now want less space and a no
17 maintenance condominium lifestyle, without stairs,
18 lawn mowing or gutter cleaning, and they want to be
19 near their children, grandchildren, friends and
20 their favorite stores and restaurants. There's a
21 predominant trend now not to relocate to Florida in
22 your golden years, but to stay where everyone who
23 is important to you is. We expect this demographic
24 to be the parents of grown children living nearby
25 in single family homes. They will average about

1 1.75 residents per household. I'm paraphrasing
2 from an NAHB study on this subject. These
3 residents will be neighborly, conscientious and
4 tidy. They are, some analysts refer to this market
5 segment as better off Baby Boomers. It would be
6 easy to overlook some of the implications of this
7 market segment, but consider that these residents
8 are not commuting. They generally don't contribute
9 to morning or afternoon rush hour peaks or street
10 congestion because they are pursuing a more
11 leisurely schedule and are out and about during the
12 off hours of traffic activity.

13 Also, I'll add, seniors contribute to the
14 tax base, but don't consume public education
15 services. This population segment also tends to
16 benefit the community through voluntary-ism and
17 they strengthen community culture through their
18 support of the arts, parks and local specialty
19 retailers. Having discretionary income and an
20 interest in maintaining their surroundings, stable
21 senior empty-nesters spend their money in ways that
22 benefit the community as a whole. Providing
23 attractive housing options locally for this
24 demographic also helps stabilize the greater
25 community as they in turn provide help as needed to

1 each other, to their adult children and to their
2 grandchildren who are now entering the work force,
3 undertaking higher education and creating new
4 households.

5 I'd also like to address the flexibility of
6 a R-3 PUD and what's known in the zoning ordinance
7 as a binding commitment. In our informational
8 meeting we highlighted the benefits of the R-3 PUD
9 and the flexibility that it gives us to provide
10 buffers and not simply chop up the land into equal
11 squares; and we might say that the flexible
12 standards associated with an R-3 PUD are only
13 flexible until it is approved. Then they are
14 fixed. We understand that this is vitally
15 important to the public and to us, the developer,
16 or to the developer, because once a majority of the
17 zoning commission members and the township trustees
18 are satisfied that the proposed development with
19 all the particulars of its layout, building
20 density, building sizes and footprints, streets,
21 buffers, grading and landscaping and so on, comply
22 with the written standards and criteria in the code
23 of ordinances, then the approved final development
24 plan becomes quote, a binding commitment for the
25 proposed development.

1 An actual development from site
2 improvements to the buildings themselves must
3 substantially conform with the approved site
4 development plan. Otherwise, the proponent must
5 return and submit to review by the board of
6 trustees any deviations from the approved plan. We
7 understand that even if the property is
8 subsequently transferred, the succeeding owner must
9 build according to the approved plan or start the
10 process over. If there are any concerns that an
11 approval at this stage could lead to undesirable
12 development, those concerns should be put to rest
13 by the planned unit development process. Approval
14 or disapproval is preserved to the zoning
15 commission and the board of trustees, but what they
16 approve is what will get built.

17 I'd also like to touch on, as I mentioned
18 earlier, our conservative utilization of R-3 PUD.
19 I've made a chart here that outlines on the left in
20 red and blue the allowances under R-3 PUD. This
21 would allow 99 dwelling units. That's six dwelling
22 units per acre. We are proposing 69 dwelling
23 units, which works out to 4.15 dwelling units per
24 acre. The maximum building and paving coverage
25 allowable is 70%, as calculated by GBC Design.

1 what we're proposing is 36%. As we mentioned
2 earlier, the maximum dwelling units per building
3 can be as high as four. We are not proposing any
4 four-unit buildings; only seven triplex buildings
5 and the remainder duplex buildings. So an average
6 of two and a quarter dwelling units per building.

7 The minimum setback from perimeter allowed
8 under R-3 PUD is 25 feet. You'll see on the site
9 plan that on the south we're allowing 41 feet, on
10 the west, 47, on the east, 48 and 49 feet, and on
11 the north where the existing residents front on
12 Stuhldreher, we're providing 99 feet and 75 feet,
13 and in those areas, providing mounds, berms,
14 plantings and, of course, buffer. The minimum open
15 space required for R-3 PUD attached is zero, but
16 I've made a rough calculation of what would in our
17 proposed layout, what that open space would
18 effectively be, and that's approaching in the
19 neighborhood of three acres which would be about
20 18%. You'll see that that's a very favorable
21 percentage if it were compared with other
22 developments, or other classifications where the
23 open space is required. Perimeter buffers and
24 landscape requirements, there are none in R-3 PUD,
25 but we are proposing evergreen planted berms on

1 three sides with a berm height ranging with the
2 width of the berm from 3 feet to 8 feet, and with
3 the evergreen planting, this is intended to provide
4 site privacy, as I said, for the existing residents
5 and also the new residents in this community.

6 Finally, the minimum first floor area under
7 R-3 PUD is 750 square feet, and as you see in the
8 summary, we are proposing to provide 1775 square
9 feet to 1818. Finally, ending here, I think we've
10 addressed this, but protecting views and privacy
11 for existing adjacent residences, we've taken this
12 very seriously, as we understand that we're the new
13 neighbor and we want to be good neighbors and
14 preserve the quality of life that is the reason for
15 them living where they do, and so we've provided
16 these buffer areas, plantings and landscaping to
17 maintain their quality of life the very best that
18 we can.

19 I'll mention one last thing. One question
20 that sometime comes up is the demand on public
21 services, and I'll note that we're providing
22 private streets. These are private streets with
23 private snowplowing and salting. The maintenance
24 is private. The township will not even need to go
25 into the development. They won't plow. We've even

1 provided, in consultation with township staff, a
2 little spot where they can terminate their run on
3 Bermuda Street, dump their snow on the proposed
4 development property and return and go off and
5 finish their work elsewhere in the township. Not
6 only will they not have to plow this community,
7 this neighborhood, but we've made it just a little
8 bit easier for them to do their job.

9 Finally, the target demographic we believe
10 will be a great addition to the township. We'd be
11 happy to respond to questions. Certainly we
12 appreciate your attention and ultimately here
13 tonight, respectfully request a favorable
14 recommendation on your part to the township
15 trustees.

16 MR. CONLEY: The timing on the development,
17 when might you start if you got approval?

18 MR. RICHINS: Well, the approval process,
19 of course, has some lead time itself, but I think
20 we'd be aiming at next building season. Roughly
21 eighteen months from now. I'll add, I'm sorry,
22 that besides myself to answer any questions, we do
23 have John Walsh, as I mentioned, and we have the
24 developer, Dwight Yoder, here in case there are any
25 specific questions.

1 MR. CONLEY: The entrance across from
2 Piperglen, that's already owned by the same parcel
3 where the field is now, is that --

4 MR. RICHINS: Correct. And you can see
5 where the dark boundary line, it's kind of a comb
6 shape, at Stuhldreher, there are three portions of
7 the existing combination of parcels. The
8 combination of the four parcels have this -- have
9 three areas where it reaches out and meets
10 Stuhldreher.

11 MR. CONLEY: And the lower access road is
12 also part of one of the parcels?

13 MR. RICHINS: Yes, this, the main entrance,
14 and this one are all part of the parcel. This one,
15 it's not intended to be used. It'll simply be
16 green space. This one we did note was the
17 emergency access.

18 MR. CONLEY: Questions? Thank you.

19 MR. RICHINS: Thank you.

20 MR. CONLEY: John, were you up next, or was
21 there anyone else who was going to speak on behalf
22 of the developer or the owner?

23 MR. WALSH: I'd be happy to answer
24 questions.

25 MR. CONLEY: Okay. Thank you. Is there

1 anyone here who wishes to speak on behalf of the
2 applicant? Yes, sir. Come on up.

3 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Why would you consider --

4 MR. CONLEY: No. Come on up.

5 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Come up?

6 MR. CONLEY: Do you want to speak in favor
7 of the applicant?

8 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: No. I'm going to ask the
9 zoning board a question.

10 MR. CONLEY: Well, we'll get to that.

11 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay.

12 MR. CONLEY: Okay. Is there anyone who
13 wishes to speak in opposition to the applicant?

14 MS. KUNKLE: Hi there. Sorry. I didn't
15 sign in. I didn't think I would be able to stay
16 this long, but my name is Amy Kunkle. I own the
17 five-acre parcel that's just on the bottom here.
18 It's labeled like Anthony and Sara Marino, but I
19 bought it recently, and I am opposed to this zoning
20 change. Firstly, because I feel that RR was
21 designed and intended to reduce the load on the
22 township municipal services, and they did address
23 that. However, I feel like the optimal user as a
24 55 plus person is a nice target market, but we
25 can't really control that unless they do put an age

1 restriction on it, and so by changing it to R-3,
2 they are actually creating excessive demands on our
3 township services. Secondly, and I did send in a
4 letter - I'm sorry - some of you may have already
5 read this, but just for the record, I believe that
6 69 units is too many for this space. I think that,
7 you know, one of the things that's been happening
8 with all of the rezoning and, you know, I see that
9 this is, you know, an R-3 between the R-2s and
10 R-4s, and I feel like that's just adding insult to
11 injury. It's sort of creating a stigma in that
12 area. I feel like there's already kind of a
13 decline because of apartments and non-owner
14 occupied homes.

15 So with that said, the third thing is, I'm
16 not sure if the open space is not required because
17 of attached dwelling units. The way that I was
18 reading the design criteria for R-3 is that there
19 were several design requirements for that as well
20 as, you know, I want to point out that they are
21 taking about a third of the property that is
22 heavily wooded, you know, and I feel like the
23 comprehensive plan states that Jackson values green
24 space and has, you know, all these nice things to
25 say about nature and parks and yet open space and

1 agriculture was completely removed from the
2 comprehensive plan in the generalized zoning map
3 that they presented. And so I just want to put
4 that in as, you know, if they somehow utilize the
5 connection to Stuhldreher Park that's there, the
6 open space, I don't know if they are intending any
7 kind of walking paths, but the fact that the two
8 retention basins are basically in people's back
9 yards, I feel like that really isn't conducive to
10 people wandering around and enjoying nature, you
11 know, behind other people's homes. So I, you know,
12 I bought this property and I'm keeping -- I would
13 like to build one home in five acres, and I know
14 people would think that's crazy, but I like space
15 and I like nature, and I don't want to see that
16 entire area completely leveled. So that is my
17 opinion. Thank you very much.

18 MR. CONLEY: Thank you. Somebody else?
19 Yes, sir.

20 MR. JULIAN: My name is Jeff Julian. I
21 live at 7291 Stuhldreher, which is right at the
22 entrance, which I've lived there for now I think
23 about 33 years. Always knew that there was going
24 to be some type of development more or less than
25 not, but at the same time, that we're all RR rural

1 residential across the street, which is Bradford
2 Farms that is R-1. I am also the trustee of the
3 Julian Farm on Julian Street, which is across from
4 a R-3 project that was put in or approved several
5 years ago. And the nice thing about it is, nice
6 thing about it is, that you can actually take a
7 look at what's going on with that. There's been
8 many different changes from the original idea of
9 how they're going to put it in. We've had to watch
10 dog it because they were going to build, you know,
11 four-plexes and so forth. And to be quite honest
12 with you, it's an eye sore, and it's also going to
13 cause some major traffic problems. The other
14 problem that we have with those kind of communities
15 is the roads. They basically become parking lots.
16 You can hardly go through them now, but this is
17 going to be a private gated community, I guess I
18 sort of understand it.

19 As far as the traffic, which I would have
20 to say that it will create a lot more traffic on
21 Stuhldreher, which I'm sure, you know, with all the
22 engineers and so forth, they've taken a look at it
23 and it was a very good presentation, but at the
24 same time, as the young lady spoke before, we are
25 starting to get a reputation over there. And

1 believe it or not, we've had builders and so forth
2 reference our area as a slum area of Jackson
3 Township. And by no means that it is. Prior to
4 the zoning regulations, yes, we do have multifamily
5 buildings and so forth.

6 I don't think there's a need for it. Now,
7 you know, it's just like with R-1 across the
8 street, I think that's really nice. I mean I fully
9 understand the Yinglings would like to sell their
10 property. We have property ourselves that we've
11 tried to sell, you know, to get down from RR to R-1
12 off of Julian Street, which was denied, for
13 whatever reason that may be. But on this
14 particular circumstance and with the number of
15 buildings, and I fully understand that, you know,
16 they're thinking it's going to be senior living,
17 and if that's the case, well, make it senior
18 living, make it 55 and over. I think they're
19 leaving it open and once it starts, then it will be
20 Katy bar the door. Yes, they do sound like they're
21 going to be fairly expensive facilities today, but
22 tomorrow, eighteen months from now, I'm not sure
23 what's going to happen with that. Things seem to
24 change as it goes down, but I think right now for
25 Stuhldreher, especially with multifamily homes, I

1 don't think it's necessary.

2 Now, as far as R-1, from RR to R-1, my
3 personal opinion, I think that's a great idea. I
4 fully understand the value of the property won't
5 have the same kind of value they would have by
6 putting these duplexes and triplexes. Spoke of
7 condominiums, you know, in the same breath, which
8 they're basically different, you know, they have
9 different opportunities to them. So either they're
10 a condo, they're a duplex, or they're a triplex,
11 and there's different things can be done with them.
12 They can be bought and rented out. And once that
13 starts happening, we lose our integrity of our
14 neighborhood, even though different people seem to
15 refer to our area as the slum area, which by no
16 means it is, but in due respect, I don't think it's
17 necessary to continue to add in that area of
18 Jackson the multi housing that they're presenting
19 today. Thank you.

20 MR. CONLEY: Sir, you had a question. If
21 you want to ask, please come up.

22 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think Jeff already
23 asked the question I wanted to ask.

24 MR. CONLEY: Your question's been answered?

25 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Pretty much so, yes.

1 MR. CONLEY: Okay. Is there anybody else
2 who wishes to speak against the proposal? Ma'am.

3 MS. SMITH: My name's Grace Smith. I own
4 the property adjacent to the gravel access road. I
5 agree with everything that was just previously
6 said. Plus, I'm also concerned with the value of
7 my property, as that will be a gravel road, and as
8 you see, the buffer doesn't even go by there, so
9 that's going to be very bad for the looks of my
10 property. The traffic, I can't imagine it not
11 affecting the traffic, 69 units, two garages, and
12 the age is not restricted. If those people have
13 jobs, that's going to be over 100 cars and it's
14 already a problem getting out on the street. But
15 mainly, my property value definitely is not going
16 to be worth as much with a gravel there with no
17 buffer or anything to see from my front yard. I
18 guess that's all. Thank you.

19 MR. JULIAN: Hello. My name's Troy Julian.
20 I live at 3110 Kennesaw Circle. My brother Jeff
21 just spoke to you. Just a couple things. Like we
22 were saying, I think my brother's very correct on
23 seeing the R-1, I think this is about, what, 18
24 acres of property, roughly? Okay. And you're
25 asking for R-3. Our family farm, and I know you

1 remember, it's not too far, we have about 32 and a
2 half acres, and we asked to R-1, about the same
3 amount of houses, roughly 65, roughly, as roughly
4 what this is, and, you know, to approve this, I
5 just don't see it. I mean you didn't approve us
6 for R-1 for houses.

7 One other thing I'd like to say, just
8 looking at this, first time I've seen it, the green
9 up against, there's Stuhldreher and the new road
10 going in, the green, them are the triplexes; am I
11 correct saying that? And then up above there,
12 heading to the park, where the people that lived
13 here, like I use Benny Stuhldreher as a example,
14 he's up that way, I grew up and, of course, it's a
15 farm, know Benny, and my brother Jeff, of course,
16 he's got the entrance, you're putting up the
17 triplexes pretty close to the people that have been
18 there all their lives. I get back there in a way
19 maybe, because maybe it's back towards that end
20 where there's condos, I think, but just that style
21 there, I think that's kind of rude to put the
22 triplexes up against the people that have been
23 there for a long time. But that's pretty much
24 about it. My big point is, roughly 18 acres, 65 or
25 whatever units, compared to our family farm of 32

1 and a half acres, and there was roughly 65 houses
2 and we were turned down, and I know Mr. Yingling
3 wants to sell it, I get it. But that's all I have
4 to say. Thank you.

5 MR. CONLEY: Thank you. Was there anyone
6 else who wished to speak against the proposal?
7 Okay. If the proponent wants to answer any
8 questions that have been asked by the folks, that
9 would be fine. You certainly don't have to. Okay.
10 Thank you.

11 MR. GANTZ: Can we ask a few questions?

12 MR. CONLEY: Yeah. I'm sorry? Oh, yeah.
13 I'm sorry, Justin.

14 MR. GANTZ: That's alright. Just a couple
15 questions I had. One, are all of these units for
16 sale product or do you envision renting those as
17 well?

18 MR. RICHINS: They will be condominiums
19 that will be sold.

20 MR. GANTZ: And then is there any condo
21 association or bylaws or anything that would
22 prevent those from being rented at a later point?

23 MR. RICHINS: They haven't been prepared
24 yet. The bylaws have not been prepared yet.

25 MR. GANTZ: Okay.

1 MS. HEAD: Who's responsible for creating
2 the bylaws; does the developer do it?

3 MR. RICHINS: It has to be done by an
4 attorney, but that attorney would be hired by the
5 developer, of course.

6 MS. HEAD: Okay. And then that HOA is
7 turned over then, those bylaws are turned over to a
8 homeowners association that is required by law, if
9 I'm correct.

10 MR. RICHINS: Correct.

11 MS. HEAD: If I'm understanding correctly.

12 MR. RICHINS: When the sales reach a
13 certain percentage, it triggers the beginning of a
14 transition. Ultimately, I think it's when 75% are
15 sold. By then the HOA is controlling and managing.

16 MS. HEAD: And managing the unit. Okay.
17 Do you have another question?

18 MR. GANTZ: Yeah. Are any sidewalks or
19 street lights --

20 MS. HEAD: You and I had the same question.

21 MR. RICHINS: Street lights, absolutely.
22 This, of course, is a preliminary plan and the
23 street lighting will be determined and worked out,
24 but we're proposing traditional street lights, good
25 lighting in the streets. This will appear very

1 much like a public street, with the exception of
2 the sidewalks, but the lighting and paving, and all
3 those details.

4 MR. GANTZ: Concrete curb and everything
5 like that, okay.

6 MR. RICHINS: Yes.

7 MS. HEAD: Did you say there would be
8 sidewalks?

9 MR. RICHINS: No.

10 MS. HEAD: No sidewalks, okay.

11 MR. GANTZ: I think the question was
12 mentioned too, are there any walking paths or site
13 access? I mean you have some of the retention
14 ponds, I see the fountain. Is there any way to
15 access those or is it just kind of a visual thing?

16 MR. RICHINS: All the residents, of course,
17 would have access to them, would be able to access
18 them. They'd be available at any time to any of
19 the residents.

20 MR. GANTZ: That's all I have.

21 MS. HEAD: Can you tell me a little bit
22 more about these retention basins.

23 MR. RICHINS: Let's have John respond to
24 that.

25 MS. HEAD: Okay.

1 MR. RICHINS: But I'll just add that, you
2 know, there's a fountain in the front one, so it
3 has a visual effect, but they also serve a
4 practical purpose for storm water management.

5 MR. WALSH: Good evening. My name is John
6 Walsh with GBC Design, 565 White Pond Drive, Akron,
7 Ohio. Retention ponds will be wet. They'll have
8 water in them all the time. They're meant to kind
9 of act as two things. They'll have some fountains
10 as an aesthetic feature, and then they'll handle
11 the storm water management for the entire project.
12 So all the storm sewer, everything's going to be
13 collected from the streets, the roof drains, go
14 through the ponds and then be discharged to along
15 the south property line. There's actually a major
16 storm sewer that exists along the south property
17 line, and the ponds will discharge to that point.
18 And as Mr. Reed indicated, it's a condo
19 association, so really all the grass is owned by
20 the condo association. It's a common area, so
21 they'll have free, you know, free rein to walk and
22 use those common areas.

23 MS. HEAD: Do those retention ponds require
24 maintenance?

25 MR. WALSH: Yes.

1 MS. HEAD: And that is a job of the
2 homeowner association to take care of that as part
3 of the maintenance, the condo dues, I'm assuming?

4 MR. WALSH: Right, the condo dues will do
5 that. As part of the approval, I believe this will
6 go through Stark Soil and Water Conservation
7 District, and as part of their review, they'll have
8 a long term maintenance plan that we'll prepare
9 with them, and then that plan gets turned over to
10 the homeowners association, or the condo, kind of
11 as a guidance. They know what they have to do, you
12 know, when they take ownership of it, as far as the
13 maintenance, yeah.

14 MS. HEAD: All right. Can you -- I'm not
15 sure who would answer this question, but tell me
16 just a little bit about the private road. So the
17 developer puts in the roads.

18 MR. WALSH: Yes.

19 MS. HEAD: Curbs, storm sewers, blah, blah,
20 blah.

21 MR. WALSH: Right.

22 MS. HEAD: They do snowplowing, the
23 association owns the roads, the township does not
24 do snowplowing.

25 MR. WALSH: Correct.

1 MS. HEAD: Do they do any type of
2 maintenance like pothole fixing or anything like
3 that?

4 MR. WALSH: Absolutely not. It's owned
5 by --

6 MS. HEAD: Completely.

7 MR. WALSH: The condo association will own
8 and maintain the roads.

9 MS. HEAD: Really owns and maintains the
10 roads.

11 MR. WALSH: Yes. So there's no public
12 responsibility at all for maintenance.

13 MS. HEAD: Okay.

14 MR. CONLEY: This is probably not for you,
15 John, but the question was asked about whether the
16 units would be available for rent, and I don't
17 think we got an answer other than that's to be
18 determined by the HOA bylaws and restrictions, but
19 I think Mr. Yoder's done this before, so what's the
20 likelihood?

21 MR. YODER: Good evening. Dwight Yoder.
22 P.O. Box 250, Uniontown, Ohio. P.O. Box 250.
23 These are being developed as condominiums to be
24 sold. Standard condominium documents, nothing out
25 of the ordinary. It doesn't preclude, they never

1 do exclusively preclude somebody renting their
2 condo out, but the intent is to sell these.

3 MS. HEAD: So the homeowners association
4 could form, there's an attorney involved, they
5 form the laws, the rules that go with that condo
6 association for the tenants to follow - not
7 tenants - the owners to follow, and they could
8 or could not put in a clause that says, Yes, you
9 can rent it, no you cannot?

10 A. (Indicating affirmatively).

11 Q. What's your experience with a condo association
12 allowing rentals; do you have some experience you
13 can speak on about that?

14 A. I don't have direct experience. I'm a home builder
15 dating back to 1991. My father was a builder,
16 second generation builder. I've never developed a
17 condominium association as such. I'm primarily a
18 single family home builder, but if you look at
19 these, the layouts, these are basically single
20 family homes joined together, but that's the
21 intent. And we will form the documents. It will
22 be us up front.

23 MS. HEAD: Okay. Thank you.

24 MR. COSGROVE: What do you anticipate the
25 monthly fee to be for the association and what all

1 will it cover? Because I know experience with
2 other PUDs, maybe not in Jackson Township, but some
3 of them include the exterior maintenance of the
4 property, including the roof and the siding, and
5 some of them do not, and those that typically do
6 not unfortunately fall in disrepair.

7 MR. YODER: Yeah. That's not where we're
8 going with this. I mean these would be all
9 encompassing to cover the roads, you know, the
10 common area grass, the roof, siding, yeah. Do I
11 have an exact dollar number right now? I'm not
12 going to put a number to that, but this will be a
13 class A development.

14 MR. COSGROVE: Thank you.

15 MR. WESTON: I wanted to comment on the
16 question for reserving it for retirees versus
17 non-retirees and the thought process behind that.

18 MR. YODER: So, you know, we're not going
19 to age restrict. It becomes a little harder to
20 finance a project when you do that, so we're not
21 going to do that, but everything tells us that that
22 is a significant demographic for this product in
23 this location.

24 MR. WESTON: Okay.

25 MR. CONLEY: Anything else?

1 MR. COSGROVE: Just one last question. Are
2 you going to seek HUD approval for these to be
3 financed as FHA and VA?

4 MR. YODER: No.

5 MR. COSGROVE: So it will be conventional
6 and cash finance for these units only?

7 MR. YODER: That is correct. I do want to
8 correct one statement from earlier this evening. I
9 think Reed mentioned that these will have cement
10 siding on the exterior. There may have been a
11 miscommunication between he and I. This will be
12 vinyl siding, high quality vinyl siding. I don't
13 want to leave you with that bit of wrong
14 information, so --

15 MR. CONLEY: Okay. Unless there's
16 something else, we'll close the meeting to public
17 comment, and I would ask the commission to
18 consider.

19 MR. WESTON: Okay. I'll start. So looking
20 through, and I did -- one other comment I did want
21 to make with the R-1 and the PUD, and what we did
22 have, some of the other zoning changes that has
23 been made, the PUD does add that layer of
24 restriction, as I think most of us are familiar
25 with, that PUD does make this conform to this

1 drawing. And I know this is not the final drawing,
2 which for me, I don't like seeing, but I know
3 before it goes through our trustees and everything
4 else, it's going to be the final form, so at that
5 time everyone will be able to see it and know and
6 say, you know, yes or no on this, but that versus
7 like an R-1, where really, as long as it conforms
8 to the, you know, the minimum project area, the
9 minimum street frontage and the maximum building
10 per units, as long as it fits, it fits, and there's
11 obviously some other restrictions there, but that
12 is good. And also having more multifamily in this
13 area is challenging, but the other thing that I
14 look at when I'm looking at this too, is given the
15 area, given the use case of it, the stepping fits.
16 And also the pricing. Even at 60% of the stated
17 values, looking at all the values of the homes in
18 the contiguous area, even compared to the new homes
19 being built, you know, across the way there, you
20 know, the closest there, it's still a significant
21 increase. So that's in terms of valuation, I know
22 it's not a straight valuation, but just looking at
23 that, I would say well, we have the pricing up
24 comparatively, which is good. I know it's a wash,
25 because we don't know what the future holds,

1 anything can change, but seeing how this parcel is
2 being used and fits in, I can see where the plan
3 fits into the overall plan and how things, even
4 looking at that area, my house, the neighborhood I
5 live in, is right next to like 80 acres of farm,
6 but it's this exact same thing. It's a little
7 portion of farm, then there's like my little area
8 that says it's all residential or all, yeah,
9 residential, not rural residential, even though
10 there's farms and parks and everything else around
11 it, and that's, you know, that's part of, you know,
12 how the plan is laid, but I think the plan is good.
13 I think it does fit.

14 I would like to see, you know, the final
15 exact plan to say this is where things are going to
16 be, this is exactly where, you know, how many units
17 are going to be there, not just, you know, say it's
18 going to come, to have it come to us, even though
19 it is earlier on in the stages, we've seen the
20 final plans before and it's something I'd like to
21 see normally come before us. Thanks.

22 MR. GANTZ: So thank you everyone for your
23 comments tonight. It was really helpful. You
24 know, I think the idea with the comprehensive plan
25 showing this as, it's been targeted by the township

1 to go beyond rural residential, so, you know, I
2 think having to start to consider this as something
3 else is important and it makes sense for us to do
4 that tonight, you know, given the surrounding
5 context with R-2 and even R-4, I do think R-3 is a
6 reasonable transition in this general area. And to
7 be frank, I think valuing this target market,
8 target audience of seniors, I think is great for
9 our community. I really, I think the plan is well
10 thought out. Yes, it is dense, but I think it's
11 done in a nice way, and I think it's a thoughtful
12 approach to how do we serve the community and kind
13 of the market audience for this area.

14 That said, I do have a couple concerns. My
15 biggest concern is how you buffer the RR properties
16 along Stuhldreher, you know, I acknowledge the
17 comment that when you have a three-unit building
18 going in right behind an RR house, that's a pretty
19 big change to come along and have that happen. You
20 know, I understand there's a buffer, but even from
21 a zoning standpoint, you know, what we've seen
22 before and what I think could be done, is to ask
23 for a separate zoning application for that, those
24 first couple lots. So, you know, what you could do
25 is bifurcate your plan, have three RR, or R-1 lots

1 buffering the RR as a way to transition into your
2 property. So you might lose a couple units. I
3 don't even know if you would, because you could
4 still spread them out, but it would be in my mind a
5 better transition from RR to the R-3. And then I
6 also acknowledge, I believe Mrs. Smith's comment, I
7 mean having a gravel road going in 20 feet from
8 your front porch, you know, I think that's a
9 miscommunication there. I think a buffer should be
10 in there as a way to provide some, you know,
11 visibility to a gravel road. So, Mrs. Smith, I
12 thank you for coming out and expressing that
13 tonight.

14 And I guess my final comment, and we're
15 allowed to comment on aesthetics and so I'm going
16 to, you know, I'm a little underwhelmed by the
17 design of these in general. Again, I think the
18 product in concept is really well thought out and I
19 love targeting seniors, but I think there's a
20 little bit more that could be done to the design.
21 I'm an architect as well, so I think about these
22 things too. You know, in general, front porches, I
23 see one on the duplex and one on the triplex, you
24 know, I don't know if there's a way that all units
25 could have a front porch to try to bring residents

1 and community out to their front yard to hopefully
2 build more of a community there. You know, the
3 roof line is, especially on the three-unit, is just
4 massive. I even look at the Ryan Home developments
5 across the street, you know the way they at least
6 break those up somehow to kind of, you know, break
7 the massing up of that a little bit I think could
8 be helpful and, you know, the rest of it is just
9 kind of personal preference, but that rear
10 elevation is just a massive wall of vinyl siding.
11 I'm wondering if there's another way to address
12 that. We're not here to rule on that, but we're
13 allowed to share our opinions, so that's where I'm
14 at. But, again, I think that the idea is right. I
15 think there's just another level of refinement we
16 could get to before we approve it. That's all I
17 have. Thank you.

18 MS. HEAD: I think Justin and I are lock
19 step this evening because every comment that he's
20 made, he's asked, every question he's asked, he's
21 got an answer for something that's on my sheet. I
22 think the first thing, and I have personal condo
23 experience. I actually sat on a condo board years
24 ago and I understand a little bit of the inner
25 workings, and the condo association is there to

1 protect, the homeowner association is there to
2 protect the owners' interest. Those people, the
3 people that went in and spent, you know, 300,000,
4 \$250,000 on a condo want to protect their
5 investment, and that's the purpose, not only to get
6 things done that need to be done, but also to
7 protect their interest. We don't know what will
8 happen with that. It's not the builder or the
9 developer's responsibility to dictate what that's
10 going to look like, but at some point they have to
11 turn it over, and I cannot imagine that the people
12 in a development such as this wouldn't want to
13 protect their interest, and that would include not
14 renting.

15 The age restriction I understand, the
16 financing issue, but I would imagine that their
17 first job is to protect their own interests, and
18 the first thing that happens there is how do we
19 make sure we maintain our property values. So I'm
20 not as worried about that piece of it.

21 Overall the comprehensive plan does allow
22 this, because we need something other than RR and
23 R-1. You get to a certain age, and you don't want
24 to mow grass or maybe you cannot physically mow
25 grass, and you don't want to pay somebody to mow

1 grass, or maybe you do want to pay somebody to mow
2 your grass, and that is a condo association. I
3 mean the comprehensive plan does allow this kind of
4 housing. I don't think this is out of step with
5 what's going on around it.

6 There is a lot of multifamily housing back
7 there. I've driven through and around and did my
8 kind of research, I've done it four times, I've
9 spent a total of about four hours driving, just
10 driving around seeing what's around this. I went
11 to the Ryan home thing, I went again today, I went
12 across the street. I was across Stuhldreher in the
13 allotment there. There's a lot of multifamily
14 housing back there. The difference is, this is the
15 right kind of multifamily housing. This is what,
16 if you're going to have multifamily housing of that
17 kind of, you know, connected living spaces, you
18 want this kind. This is what you want. I don't
19 obviously have a problem with the plan, except I
20 have written down exactly what Justin said. I have
21 to say that, you know, it's nothing we can really
22 rule on, but I think that the three units that are
23 closest to Stuhldreher, I'm not a fan of those, and
24 I'm not a fan of the lack of the buffer behind the
25 gravel drive, although it is only going to be used

1 in a knox situation. So that's not a horrible
2 thing. It's only, you know, there's not going to
3 be anybody accessing that road unless there's an
4 emergency, in which case you understand when it
5 would be accessed, because something bad has
6 happened to somebody. I don't personally believe
7 that the three -- I don't personally think there
8 should be three units in here, just because who
9 wants to live in that building unit, honestly. I
10 mean an end unit has more windows. I don't
11 understand why they're in here. I think if you're
12 really going for that demographic, I mean do it or
13 don't, and I think the three-unit kind of detracts
14 from that, but it is allowed and it is less than
15 the zoning, the intense type of zoning that's
16 allowed under this R-3 PUD, and the R-3 PUD,
17 honestly it allows us control over, we look at this
18 and we know that it's not going to change in any
19 significant fashion from what's on here. So that
20 makes me happy. And the fact that it's private
21 roads, that even was a nice surprise, to be honest.
22 The township doesn't maintain them, the township
23 doesn't plow them. They don't do anything with
24 them, which I think is a good thing.

25 Somebody made a comment about starting to

1 get a reputation. Honestly, that reputation
2 already exists, but it's apartments. You cannot
3 compare apartments to condos. You just can't do
4 it. Apartments are apartments. They are non-owner
5 occupied. We have a contract to let me live in
6 your building and I will treat it as such or I
7 won't. A condo, you have a mortgage. No different
8 than a house. You have a mortgage. You own from
9 what the studs in or the drywall in. You take
10 care, you insure your -- anything you can affect
11 inside your unit, if your unit catches on fire, you
12 have enough insurance to cover everything that
13 would burn down. It is a home. Whether it's
14 connected to other homes, doesn't matter, it's
15 still a home, a home you own. So I have to say
16 that I'm not -- I don't dislike this at all, to be
17 honest. I thought -- I really in my preparation
18 tried to find reasons to not like it and I have to
19 say that I really don't have any. I think it fits
20 the area and it fits the demographics for Jackson
21 Township.

22 MR. CONLEY: Thank you, Chylece. I don't
23 want to belabor the points that were made, which I
24 think were very well spoken. But I hope,
25 Mr. Yoder, that you'll at least consider that some

1 objective Jackson Township residents think that
2 some additional buffering on that one road is
3 appropriate. If you converted the three units to
4 two units, you would lose seven. Is that a deal
5 killer for you? I would hope not. And when you
6 get down to the point where you're going to hire
7 that attorney to write those bylaws, I sure hope
8 you write them in that there is -- you cannot rent.
9 I think it's just -- you're asking folks to spend
10 300 to 350,000 and not ensuring that their
11 neighbors are going to be homeowners is a mistake.
12 I can't tell you how to do your business, but I
13 would hope that you would at least consider that.

14 Any other comments?

15 MR. COSGROVE: well, I was going to refrain
16 from speaking, but I guess based on the comments,
17 I'm going to share. I do think, I mean based on
18 what the one gentleman said, you know, this has
19 been an area of maybe that people have stigmatized
20 of Jackson Township, but I will say if you end up
21 having the prices that you feel that you're going
22 to have, I don't know that that's going to bring
23 the value down of anybody's home. Rather up than
24 down. And I think using the language as
25 multifamily, these are not multifamily units.

1 These are condos. So that's a single family home
2 that just happen to be attached. So I don't see
3 these as multifamily. That's all.

4 MR. CONLEY: Okay. I am going to ask for a
5 motion to approve the resolution, and that motion
6 to approve is not necessarily that the person
7 making the motion is in favor. It's just a matter
8 of getting it on the table. And so our approach to
9 this is that we have a motion and a second to
10 approve, and then each commission member will vote
11 and those who make the motion are not required to
12 vote in favor of their own motion, if that makes
13 sense. I hope it does.

14 MS. HEAD: I'd like to make a motion to
15 approve this amendment.

16 MR. GANTZ: I will second.

17 MS. POINDEXTER: Mr. Weston?

18 MR. WESTON: Yes.

19 MS. POINDEXTER: Ms. Head?

20 MS. HEAD: Yes.

21 MS. POINDEXTER: Mr. Cosgrove?

22 MR. COSGROVE: Yes.

23 MS. POINDEXTER: Mr. Gantz?

24 MR. GANTZ: No.

25 MS. POINDEXTER: And Mr. Conley?

1 MR. CONLEY: Yes. We will forward our
2 recommendation to the trustees. The trustees will
3 meet?

4 MS. POINDEXTER: November 24th at 5:00, and
5 the meeting will be again in this room. The only
6 other business we have is the September 17th
7 transcript approval.

8 MS. HEAD: Isn't that Thanksgiving?

9 MS. POINDEXTER: No. The 26th is
10 Thanksgiving.

11 MS. HEAD: Okay.

12 MS. POINDEXTER: So I just need a motion to
13 approve the transcript.

14 MS. HEAD: I make a motion to approve the
15 transcript.

16 MR. COSGROVE: Second.

17 MS. POINDEXTER: So we have Mr. Weston?

18 MR. WESTON: Yes.

19 MS. POINDEXTER: Ms. Head?

20 MS. HEAD: Yes.

21 MS. POINDEXTER: Mr. Cosgrove?

22 MR. COSGROVE: Yes.

23 MS. POINDEXTER: Mr. Gantz?

24 MR. GANTZ: Yes.

25 MS. POINDEXTER: And I'm going to ask

1 Mr. Sutter, who was in the audience, because he was
2 here.

3 MR. SUTTER: Yes.

4 MS. POINDEXTER: Okay. That's all I have.
5 Thanks.

6 MR. CONLEY: Thanks everybody. We're
7 adjourned.

8

9

- - - - -

10

11

(Meeting adjourned at 6:26)

12

13

- - - - -

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF OHIO)

STARK COUNTY)

I, Deanna Gleckler, a Registered Professional Reporter, Certified Realtime Reporter, and Notary Public in and for the state of Ohio, duly commissioned and qualified, do hereby certify that the within Zoning Commission Hearing was by me reduced to Stenotypy and afterwards transcribed upon a computer, and that the foregoing is a true and correct transcription of the Hearing so given to the best of my ability.

I do certify that this Hearing was taken at the time and place in the foregoing caption specified. I do further certify that I am not a relative, counsel or attorney of either party, or otherwise interested in the event of this action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal of office at Salem, Ohio on this 4th day of November, 2020.

DEANNA GLECKLER, RPR-CRR, Notary Public
My commission expires 1-6-25.