

STRONGSVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES OF MEETING

January 28, 2021

The Planning Commission of the City of Strongsville met at the City Council Chambers located at 18688 Royalton Road, on **Thursday, January 28, 2021 at 5:30 p.m.**

Present: Planning Commission Members: Gregory McDonald, Chairman; Edward Pfahl; Brian David and Kim Veris; City Council Representative, Matthew Schonhut; Administration: Assistant Law Director, Daniel Kolick; and Assistant Engineer, Lori Daley

There was no Caucus at this meeting.

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 PM by the Chairman, Mr. McDonald.

Roll Call:	Members Present:	Mr. McDonald Mr. Pfahl Mr. Veris Mr. Schonhut Mr. David
	Also Present:	Mrs. Daley, Asst. Engineer Mr. Kolick, Asst. Law Dir. Carol Brill, Recording Secy.

MOTION TO EXCUSE:

Mr. David - Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McDonald – Mr. David.

Mr. David - I move to excuse Mary Jane Walker and Mayor Perciak for just cause.

Mr. Pfahl – Second.

Mr. McDonald – Secretary, please call the roll.

Roll Call: All Ayes APPROVED

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. McDonald – You have had a chance to review the minutes of January 14, 2021. If there are no additions or corrections they will stand as submitted. First Item on the Agenda under Referrals from Council, we have an Ordinance 2020-104. Before we get started, just to let everybody know in the audience, our intent here tonight is to listen to a presentation on the proposed Ordinance and the program they want to put forth for the City of Strongsville. Because of the nature of this and the substantial nature of the discussion we will not be voting on this tonight. Today it gives us an opportunity to listen to the presentation and for the Planning Commission members to ask questions and for us to then reconvene at our next meeting to move things forward. You are all welcome to stay, we are happy to have you here as part of the audience, there will not be audience participation this evening per our processes and procedures but I would also ask the Planning Commission to hold you questions until the end and then we can do a Q & A with the applicant. That being said; Mr. Rinker.

Mr. Rinker, just for the record and for everyone's benefit, we do have a court recorder who is going to be able to take everything down that we provide as well as the audio that the City has. My name is Bruce Rinker, I and my firm, Mansour Gavin, we are land use counsel for North Park Developers for this matter. Our address for the record is 1001 Lakeside Avenue, Cleveland, Suite 1400. I am going to try to be brief but everyone knows that only lawyers can call a multiple page document a brief but I would like to provide a little overview for everyone's benefit and then Chris Bender will be able to speak to address the issues that he wants to explain for the overall plan the petitions reflect. Then we have our Planning Expert, Kristen Hopkins, who is here and a lot of the substantive information that we are sharing with you tonight is incorporated in her report. For everyone's benefit as well, this is a packet of material that is supplemental to what was originally submitted, it includes in the first half, Mr. Bender's cover letter and the petitions of the property owners involved. This is roughly 157 or 158 acres of land seeking rezoning by the City of Strongsville, following the procedures in the City's Code. The first half is that document, the second tab is the report that has been provided by Kristen Hopkins and David Hart from CT Consultants. Again, this is really the heart of the matter. Third tab we have from Boehning and Associates, sort of a preliminary engineering overview of the difficulties, kind of the obstacles that one would face in developing the properties that are at issue for the rezoning. The fourth item is the Master Plan, Ordinance, the Legislation and then there is a whole document that was brought into the City through the Cuyahoga County Planning Commission and this Ordinance reflects the Council's approval and adoption of the Master Plan originally done in 2018, updated in 2019 and that is Ordinance 2019-30. Then I included a couple of other maps but we will go to a set of maps that we have drawn primarily from Ms. Hopkins and Mr. Hart's report. I will get to those momentarily. The jumping off point and Chris Bender will be able to explain it in even more detail, the personal as well as a professional philosophy that he has. The jumping off point for all of us in this

presentation really is the Master Plan that the City adopted a little over a year or year and a half ago. I just want to read an excerpt because I think it points to the discussion that we are presenting tonight. There are a number of whereas's that is the usual format. Whereas the City acknowledges that a Comprehensive Master Plan is necessary to the coordinated and successful development of the City as it advances into the future. That proper development cannot occur in a vacuum but must be based on sound study and planning and in a coordinated manner. Little bit further, the Cuyahoga County Planning Commission mission is to inform and to provide services in support of the short and the long term comprehensive planning quality of life, environment and economic development of Cuyahoga County and certainly the focus for the Master Plan is for the City of Strongsville in that larger context. It is that coordinated manner in using Planning and Zoning principals, data, a comprehensive evaluation that we believe is very much the purpose and the reason for this rezoning. To be frank, the zoning in the southwest quadrant of Strongsville for General Industry has been very important to the City and will remain so. But if one looks at the map and looks at the land uses there and the challenges that face especially the southern portion, which will be the focus of our discussion tonight, the conclusion we believe by objective evaluation is that the General Industrial Zoning for these southerly acres, especially the properties that are part of this petition, is not reasonable, it is not feasible to develop, it does not help the property owners, it doesn't help the City, it doesn't help the community. That really is our purpose and our mission is to explain why we believe that the proposal is superior to the existing zoning. So I just wanted to start with that. I've got, hope you can all see the screen, this is a collection of maps that are contained in the Hopkins and the Hart report. You are all familiar with this, this is looking north and I want to suggest that right about the midpoint here, this is Drake Road and it is kind of the Mason Dixon line for this southwest quadrant of the City. To the north you have well established, well developed industrial development along with a lot of municipal facilities. South of Drake, it's a different ballgame all together. Most of the vacant land in Cuyahoga County that is zoned for industrial purposes can be found down in this southern half, southern quarter probably of that quadrant. This is a preview, this is essentially a visual of the petitions that are before the Planning Commission and before the City ultimately for Council's consideration, depending on Planning Commission's recommendation. You are familiar with this, I will be very quick, again, this is Prospect Road on the east side. You can see Drake, that dividing line up to the north. To the west is really kind of a midpoint. A little bit further beyond Foltz. Farther to the West would be Marks Road and Lorain County and then down to the south is Boston Road. So this is all predominately interior land and then the R1-75 that is around the perimeter, which is kind of an indicated zoning. Let's see if I can zoom in here a little bit. So again, looking at the primary area, we've taken from the Master Plan some maps and then Kristen Hopkins can explain just basically how she's tried to identify different factors here. You can see in the dotted red line, this is the perimeter of

the properties that are part of the petition, so it incorporates some properties that front on Prospect over here, going deep inside the gray reflects the General Industrial. The yellow represents residential, predominantly R1-75. Over here in the very farthest southwest corner of Cuyahoga County and of the City is another chunk of land that the City owns. In broad brush the Master Plan looks to future land use strategies and in this particular area there are probably three primary targets that the Master Plan suggests the City implement. They all involve approximately the same amount of acreage; between 140 south of 160 acres. Two of those chunks of land are City owned. The third are the properties that are subject to these petitions. In the north there are about 140 acres of municipally owned and developed land that occupy prime real estate for General Industrial purposes and as we go through some of these maps I think it becomes more evident. The proximity to Royalton Road, the frontage on Foltz, the utilities that are already there, the lay of the land is pretty flat, much more developable but today, apart from certain facilities and other community uses, about 130 or 140 of those acres are recreationally used. The Master Plan suggests the better location for those would be down here in the southwest area. That is City owned property, so our position is that the City has considered in its Master Plan and we think it is an appropriate transition to take underutilized arguably mutualized land in the north part of Foltz that could be far better used for the General Industrial zoning that applies to those properties where all of these utilities and improvements exist today and move those fields to the southwest. So, this is one of the maps in the report that is taken from the City's Master Plan and we are looking again at this southeastern portion of the quadrant that is bounded by Prospect, Boston, Drake and off to the west even more, Marks Road. The key here is that there are environmental conditions, the lay of the land is very very challenging. As the Boehning Report in tab, I think it is tab #4 indicates, number 3 or 4 in the packet that we provided, the ability to develop these lands from a grading standpoint along with installing the different utilities, the adverse impacts that it creates to the environment are very substantial. This is something that is noted in the Master Plan. Again, these are listed as areas of concern. The streams and associated banks, wetlands, wooded area that would be impacted, because the extent of redevelopment that would be required just to make functional pads or pods as Boehning talks about, has an amazing impact to the properties there. Chris Bender will be able to talk to you and advise you from his perspective, his experience, how the residential development is far better suited for minimizing adverse impact to the environment and frankly can take advantage of it, both from a function and esthetic standpoint. Another problem that the Master Plan points to and Ms. Hopkins will go over it in the report, the challenges to the General Industrial zoning in the southerly portion is the fact that it is so remote from established highway corridors. When this zoning was adopted we could still get our kicks on Rt. 66. The highway system was a very different system than it is today and we all know very well, look at Royalton Road, the interchange with I 71. I think over the

years the City had hoped that there would be an opportunity to put an interchange at Boston and I 71. Very very expensive, very cost prohibitive, for whatever reason beyond that, that is not something that has happened. So you have in this south southerly portion below Drake, often the far southwestern corner of this City, you have General Industrially zoned land that really has no meaningful access to the highway system. It is about a mile and a third just to get up to Royalton Road and it is about another 3 miles to head east through town to the interstate. Those are challenges that make this kind of zoning very impractical. Again, this is from the Master Plan and it focuses upon one of the really unusual setups and we will get into in a little bit further, another map of the split zoning of these properties that indicate I was telling you about, the icing is the frontage on Boston and Prospect Roads and then the interior the cake of the zoning, the General Industrial is basically landlocked, because you can't have access to the different highways, Boston Road, Marks Road or Prospect and the properties that front there with the split zoning essentially are unable to use a fair amount of acreage especially for a number of the bowling alley lots and again Ms. Hopkins will be able detail this more. This map shows, in conjunction with the split zoning, another factor of the adjacency of General Industrial to these residential properties. As a matter of zoning policy over the years, the City has adopted very restrictive Code requirements for where you can put a building, where you can put a parking lot. Why? Because this industrial area is smack up against the back yards of these Prospect and Boston Road properties. These are excessive setback requirements. This particular map shows, the red area are the properties that are part of the petition but these are not the only properties that are affected. You see the lighter color, these are properties that are not part of the petition but they are subject to these same setbacks. When we add up the darker red acreage for the petitioners, about 35 acres, roughly a $\frac{1}{4}$ of the private property owned is unbuildable. You cannot put a structure based on the Code, on top of that Strongsville requires that there be no loading bays facing the residential areas. So all the buildings have to be oriented either north or to the west just for the trucks to access for loading purposes. On top of that as we pointed out before, you have no truck traffic that is allowed on Prospect on Marks, on Boston, the umbilical cord is going up Foltz. So, for property owners who are looking to develop for General Industrial, the City does provide incentives and we will get into that discussion later on, but the fact of the matter is, these are not as desirable in the competition with other either developed lands within the City or elsewhere in the County and the remoteness make this very impractical for General Industrial purposes. This is another map that again that shows, this is the only access way, you can't go out Lunn, because you can't go onto Prospect. Marks and Boston are inferior roads but again, they are protected against truck traffic, so the only feasible way in and out, it is like a big cul de sac, is off of Royalton Road at Foltz. Again, and I will leave this in a minute for Chris to go through his proposed plan. This is again from Cuyahoga County, these purple areas are targeted by Cuyahoga County as that future economic development

zones for Cuyahoga County. Again, the primary reason, because of the interstate highway system, the connectivity, the relationship of sites that are readily developable for economic purposes going into the future and look where we are in Strongsville and here is essentially the area that we are talking about way way down tucked away in this corner. So it is remote, access is poor, site conditions are also challenging. Kristen Hopkins, this particular map describes sort of the absorption rate, the development history in the City of Strongsville for industrial development since 2006. She will explain that in greater detail. Now here is another interesting point from the Master Plan and I want to draw you attention first to this circle. In red we've outlined the shape polygon for the properties that are part of this petition. This map, deals with potential multigenerational housing opportunities. The Master Plan points out that in the City of Strongsville, all of the residentially zoned area is built out. You basically maxed out residential space. How do you keep, how do you retain residents in Strongsville when they get to that point where they want the empty nester type of environment, that type of housing? The opportunities are not that great and these different circles on this map from the Master Plan identify, 1,2,3,4, 5 locations but significantly, I am sorry 6, significantly, again the properties that are part of this petition fall within that targeted zone for multigenerational housing opportunity and again Chris Bender will be able to talk to that. These are some examples that are shown in the Master Plan of that kind of multigenerational housing. Not your typical single family detached standalone structure with a yard. This again is where I started early on and talked about the Master Plan suggesting that you take this prime GI area, recreational uses, it is underutilizing this land and put them down here. Just look at this picture, this alone speaks volumes. Here is a soccer field level, fronting on Foltz, it is ideal, well suited for 100,000 SF building which would be a typical size and then take a look down here on the southwest corner. Our understanding is that Strongsville has already made the determination that Foltz is not going to be extended all the way down to Boston. Again, think about it, Boston is not suited for the main kind of traffic, the heavy duty traffic that you would need to service this particular area. On the other hand, recreational uses would be very compatible with the kind of network that would access in and out of this particular location. Don't want to be simplistic but again these are long term, short and long term strategies that your Master Plan is looking to. The sensitivity that we know officials have for retaining these industrial uses is sort of the future of the City. This is a perfect example of where you can do a better job of using the land that is just about ready for prime time. Here again is an example, it is a conceptual suggestion. This shows the connection to Foltz. If you look on a Google Map it is kind of a cleared area almost like a utility line. But query what kind of road you would need to be able to access here. You could come in off of Boston, in all likelihood but the suggestion is that these fields for recreational purposes can work well. Another point, and this is something I will defer again to Chris Bender, just to the east, if you had residential development where you have these ravines and streams and wetland areas where best management practices

for the development of the residential land themselves far better to that type of terrain. The adjacency, the connectivity of those residential areas that lie to the east and south to a new recreational facility could be very appealing. Again, this is broad brush but these are strategies that underscore not simply how the property zoned today doesn't function well but how it can function so much better. This again talks about the split zoning. This is a suggestion of future rezoning, again, if it is multigenerational housing, it is not shown on this map but you saw the map before where residential would work well. Then again, this illustrates, we've got Metro Parks that runs through the heart of the City over here, but down here in this area the terrain and it is pretty natural, pretty untrammled, what it would take to develop it for industrial purposes would transform that area drastically. Just a minute ago I talked about connectivity, if you are down in this area you've got parts all the way up in this part of the City. Over here the parks that are available to neighborhoods nearby, the Foltz area. Again it's underutilized, it is not an efficient and effective way to use well developed infrastructure supported prime GI land. It should go south. I am just about done here. Kristen Hopkins will elaborate on this further but we want you to pay close attention to this because we are not only talking about how the land uses can function well, this is database, it demonstrates how the proposed residential development of the petitioners properties yields a very solid economic return revenue to the City, to the schools. So our suggestion is, no matter how you look at this, what we are proposing, works far better than the existing zoning that doesn't work for these properties. In some respects where you've got these very restrictive regulations, those regulations are taking away property. Thirty Five acres that people cannot use. It is confiscatory, it is certainly is discriminatory because those lands cannot compete with ones where those restrictions do not apply. So I am done, I know I have talked a lot but I wanted to give you that overview. Chris Bender now will be able to talk to you about his proposal along with the Puzzitiello family, we think this is something worth looking at very seriously and commend you to it.

Mr. Bender – Thank you Bruce. Good evening, first of all I would like to thank the members of the Planning Commission. In years gone by I guess I have been attending Planning Commissions in Strongsville for well over 30 years. As I look around, Mary Jane Walker is not here tonight but I think she has been at every meeting that I was attending. Also, I see Dan Kolick, Dan you may have missed one or two but that is probably all you have missed in that 30 or 35 years, and I do appreciate the work these people put in.

Mr. Kolick – Hey Chris, maybe before you go forward so our record will be complete, identify yourself, your address and then tell you a little bit about your position with the developer before you start into your presentation.

Mr. Bender – Good suggestion. My name is Chris Bender, I am the President of the Land Division for the Park Group, headquarter here in Strongsville, 22700 Royalton Road. My position there is President of Land Division, anything having to do with the purchasing, approvals, engineering, financing, I do everything that has to be done with the land before Parkview Homes builds the homes, that would basically be the Puzzitiello brothers and they have been at it for 30+ years as well. I do everything that has to be done. I work with the various city departments, Engineering, Building Department, the Planning Department up until the point that we can get Building Permits. Once we take over Building Permits then the Building Division takes over, except for, there is always issues in building, there are always issues in developing that come up and I see Councilman Mark Roth in the back and the Councilman I met I guess about 30 years ago and I was proposing to convert what at that time was the abandoned Strongsville Airport into a higher end housing development and there were a lot of concerns. Mark called a meeting for his resident's right here in this very room, wasn't quite as elaborate as it was then, we had a big mural here in the back in the early days of Strongsville. But we had a meeting and people were concerned, it was their neighborhood, what is going to happen, is this going to negatively impact us? Eventually development was approved and we proceeded and the development exists today as Westwood Farms. It is the home to about 450 or 475 families. Through that time when I say it doesn't end, really when I turn it over, Mark had my phone number, Mark had my cell phone and I don't even know if we had internet in those days but he was able to call me if there was an issue. I was very happy to meet him. If there was something we could do to lesson the impact on the neighborhood, on one of the existing residents we were most happy to do that. Just a little background on the Puzzitiello family. Their father, Richard began building houses in this City in 1973 or 4 and he moved his business here in 1976 and stayed in business here, even though we've operated in multiple states, probably 40 different communities, he has always kept a headquarters here in Strongsville. Several members of the family, Rick, Roger and Ryan are here tonight. Father brought them all in the business, this is truly a locally owned family business. This isn't some out of town function. Very important for the father, Richard, always said to make sure you take care of the community, take care of the problems, don't let the problems fester, get back to the people. I think he has always inspired everybody that was privileged to do business in Strongsville. He selected Strongsville in the 70's when he was looking for a place to build, there were lots of places to build. He picked Strongsville and I am sure he picked it for location. He also picked it for the quality of the government. He felt that the government was very cohesive, the Council Members worked very hard. There were no hidden agendas, people worked together for the benefit of the future of the City and they worked extremely well with the School Board because if you have a community where the schools aren't strong eventually, as we unfortunately see in these days, communities start to fragment and pull itself apart. So schools are very important and I

am going to talk about that in the future, Bruce touched on that one chart but it was really kind of at the heart of our presentation here today. I also want to thank a couple of residents, Sofia Katakos is here, she has lived on Prospect Road on the north end, adjoining property that we own for I guess it is 28 years. Over that time period she has kind of suffered through this split zoning, what to do with her property as she starts to think about retirement now she always kind of viewed her property as somewhat of a nest egg and I think that the realization is, the way the zoning sits right now, she does not have a marketable piece of property. I also want to thank a lot of other residents that I don't know personally, I probably haven't talked to but I assume you are from further south on Prospect, possibly from Boston Road and I am glad you are here tonight because I want you to hear the whole story rather than rumors. I want you also to know that you are free to contact me. We have no secrets, we want to do this as we've done, I guess I have been in development of about 3,000 sublots in the City and I think for the most part, we've made a few mistakes and hopefully we've gone back and corrected that mistakes. This property, Mr. Puzziello bought in the 70's for the most of it. He has sat patiently by for 40 years waiting to do something with it and the promise always was there that it was going to be industrial development. As Kristen will further show, statistically that is just not happening, that is not the direction and I know the residents that adjoin this property have walked on the property, their children have walked on the property, probably built a couple tree forts and maybe even done a little deer hunting. I am glad you were able to utilize the property, it's an aesthetically beautiful piece of property but from an environmental standpoint it definitely has issues to be able to use as it is currently zoned. Okay, it can be utilized to be a spectacular residential development though and we are now proposing though as our development, we show on the north end we would like to do a mix of housing as prescribed by the Master Plan the City's presented. That really has been our inspiration that we gave the planners. We've built 3,000 single family houses, many other people have built single family houses, we are on the forefront of building cluster housing. Cluster housing typically we built has a first floor master. We actually looked at people 55, 60, 65, I used to consider them older people, now I consider them younger people. What their future housing needs are, what they were. I am not sure we've done a great job staying up to date. As of I believe today, and Ryan Puzziello and Ryan can correct me, we have only 7 sublots left where we can build that type of housing. The demand is greater than ever and again, the inspiration is the Master Plan as adopted by the City. This Planning Commission reviewed that Master Plan numerous occasions. They took their time, they reviewed it, they studied it, they asked for changes in it. City Council did the same thing, it was amended as Bruce pointed out, before its final adoption and they approved it, okay and the main theme that we realize is in that plan is that we need to create some inner generational housing. This Planning Commission here in the last few years has seen numerous Assisted Living Facilities, Memory Care Facilities, things that were needed by our aging community. We are aging as a population, we are aging as a

Country, the birth rates are down, people are living longer. These other types of housing are needed. But I think what we've done, and I commend everyone who has been instrumental in seeing that those facilities are addressed and those are built, but I think we are missing a notch, okay. When I tell you we only have seven, we only have eight sites left to build a cluster home and that would be typically for the buyer who maybe moved here. I moved here in 1974 and I built a colonial house with lots of bedrooms for my children. Okay, my children attended Allen Elementary School. Fourteen members of the Puzzitiello family are graduates of the Strongsville School System. We are very much rooted here, we are not carpet baggers, we haven't flown in, we don't have a corporate office in Houston, Texas that you can send your complaints to. But we have seen the community change, we've seen the needs change but the one thing that hasn't changed is the zoning on this property. The zoning as I have learned throughout the years is supposed to be a flexible tool. It is supposed to be designed to meet the needs of the community. The needs of the community are now for different types of housing. So and I know that picture up there doesn't really isn't into the detail that everybody can see exactly, but what we actually are proposing is four different products, okay. The first product is, we want to do some single family lots probably 25%, 20%, single family lots of a typical single family lot that you see in Strongsville 80 foot wide, probably a 2,500 or 3,000 SF house. Not a super large houses but new home that are not currently available in Strongsville. Then on the southern piece these large lots we have requested R1-100 zoning that is a minimum of 100. The reason we want the bigger lots back there is because of and the residents here can verify it, the ravines, the streams, topography, the big trees, we see those lots as being $\frac{3}{4}$ acre or maybe in some cases bigger. What we will do is those streets will be on the tops, the higher ground and a lot of those backyards will fall into the ravines. The closest thing we have to it in Strongsville, I guess would be some sections of Ledgewood and in some cases it's aged very well and some it's starting to show its age. Nonetheless right now we have buyers who would love to build that house, their ultimate house I guess you might call it in Strongsville and they have been here but they are forced to go to other communities because we have no more lots, we certainly don't have lots of that magnitude. But that would be one product, the typical single family would be another one. But most important was we want to offer detached clusters not dissimilar to what some people in this room may live in. We've built them in Westwood Farms, we've built them in Waterford Crossing, we have a large section of them in Ashley Oaks and the problem with it is that there is just not enough available. The relators tell us that if we could build 10 tomorrow they could sell 10 tomorrow. The resale market is so brisk, we've heard reports that some of these units, 10 year old units, they are selling in 3 days, they are selling in 4 days. When you have a community such as Hunting Meadows and Deerfield Lakes and even Waterford Crossing for that matter, you have people that have been in homes for 20 or 25 years, they have raised their families, they are ready to make another change before they have to go into some

sort of assisted facility. Targeted age group is probably 50 – 70, 75 okay, the other type of housing that we took the lead from the Master Plan was some sort of attached housing. By doing attached housing you can cut down some of the maintenance, you can actually bring the price down a little bit, so on the edges that we will adjoin the industrial park, the very north end, we are proposing to do some attached housing there. This is some product that we developed for a section in Avon Lake, Avon Lake is a community much smaller than Strongsville but not unlike Strongsville in its demographics, they were very concerned that they did not have housing for this age group and they had a piece of property that was zoned residential and they told us, I am sorry, zoned retail, if we were to rezone that property, request a rezoning they would give us a Conditional Use Permit to build attached housing age restricted. So that community we are now building townhouses and I believe the sale price is \$350,000.00 apiece. Some of the units will have elevators, first floor masters but they are grouped in buildings of 3 units and 4 units and sales are very brisk and the city is very happy. They don't want to see their residents that have been there that have built their community move out prematurely. So we are real excited about that but that product could also be grouped and built as age restricted. If there is a, if you want to live in a neighborhood where you don't have a lot of big wheels on your front sidewalk and then we can build another neighborhood, build that same product basically but that would be for the younger crowd, maybe the young professional group, maybe the 30 to 40 year old group, maybe the for whatever reason they don't want the yard and they don't want a big unit but again those units are probably 1,800 to 2,100 square feet. So, we have thought through this, we don't think one size fits all. We really really are attempting to address what the Master Plan has told us. I mean and I don't know, the people on the Planning Commission could certainly tell you, how many people they interviewed but they interviewed lots and lots of people in our community assessing the needs and we think that is a group that is being overlooked. A big item for me personally, okay, and I am not going to try to bring the graph up because I am not really a computer guy, historically in order to compete, to bring, quote, "commercial industrial development to your city" you have to compete. It is an economic beauty contest that you wage against other communities all over the country, particularly in northeastern Ohio and the typical company comes in which may be a subsidiary of a fortune 500 company and they say "what are you going to offer us if we move here", okay and I have heard this from numerous economic development directors in various cities. The city ends up having to put together a package of incentives if you will, we will do this for you as far as improvements, we will give you this and oh yes we will give you tax abatement. In common simple language what tax abatement means is, whatever that land is appraised at, whatever you are paying in taxes, if you are paying \$10,000.00 a year on that blank piece of land now that is what your taxes are for up to 15 years. The value of the building that we put on the property, we won't charge you real estate taxes on that for up to 15 years. Maybe negotiate it, may only be 10, may only be 8 and for that you

will bring a certain number of workers who will pay payroll taxes okay. The point is when the City does that the Metro Parks get about 6 or 7% of your real estate taxes, the public Libraries get another 4 or 5% of your real estate taxes, school district gets and I am going to misquote this, I believe it is nearly 70% of your real estate taxes go to your local schools. When abatement is put in place, those taxes go away but they do come back after 15 years if the company is still occupying the building and is still in business. But it is a long time, there is no immediate benefit for the schools or the library and the City does get a small piece, they don't get the increase but they will get some payroll taxes. So, I think that is something that is very concerning to me, our proposal, we have calculated based on the housing we want to build, the valuation of the housing that we are proposing, and this is a conceptual site plan, things will move and this Planning Commission will have to approve every single piece of pavement and the City Engineer will have reply on every set of plans, it is a 5 year program and I will be returning hopefully to this room 15 or 20 times during that period of time seeking approvals and working with the various departments at the City. So it is nothing that is a slam dunk, this doesn't happen tomorrow however, I will tell you, the schools at 120 million buildout over a 5 year period, their share of the real estate taxes are estimated to be somewhere between 16 and 17 million dollars, I am sorry, that is over the 15 year period. About a million and a half dollars per year, based on a 120 million dollar valuation. That is a significant number for the Strongsville Schools. Now you are going to say, "well yes but if they flood it with a bunch of new kids, they fill up the schools then what are we going to do". Currently the Strongsville Schools, depending on which grade level you are at, the occupancy right now is running between 78 and 83% of peak volume. In other words they can accept a lot more students without having to change infrastructure. What it does is it spreads their overhead costs over a few more students. They estimate on the current population trends in the City, somewhere between 100 and 125 new students will enter the school. This is a school system that has several, I believe it is 4,000 students now, so it is not a major increase, it can be easily accommodated in the existing infrastructure. But the fact of the matter is that we know we can put in place a flow of tax dollars for schools are pretty rewarding to us, as I said the Puzitiello's, 14 graduates of the Strongsville Schools. So I have already told you, my three kids all attended Allen School, they got their start in the Strongsville Schools. I have two grandchildren right now in the Strongsville Schools. So, cut through all the issues we have in society today, schools are so important because they are like almost like an anchor for the children, something for them to grasp onto because it is a chaotic world we live in today and hopefully next year, two years from now, things will be better. You hear a lot of stories about the kids not going to school and the emotional impact on them. It brings home to all of us that fact that schools are very important. I am not here on behalf of the Teachers Union, but my daughter said the other day her kids are back in school in the suburb that she lives in and she said after spending the last 6 months educating, working, educating my kids, taking care of everything 24 hours a day, she

said "I will never say a cross word about a teacher as long as I live". She said it is amazing what they do for us. So that is where our consideration comes from, I have probably missed, I didn't get a chance to check any of my notes, maybe that is a good thing, because I have been on all corners of this thing, I understand it, I understand the City's desire that they want to insure some future tax revenues. They don't want to be in a bind down the road. I understand existing residents in the area that say "My God we've had these woods in our back yard since we moved here" whether it is 5 years ago or 3, 5 or 40 years ago. I have talked to a couple of those residents directly and they admit that they don't really use the back but it is nice not having anything behind them. The fact of the matter is something will be behind them at some point in time. Nobody is going to be required to sell their land. I have a few property owners on the north end that are nearing retirement that you know they have said let's get this thing rezoned and go from there and that is a possibility for the rest of the homeowners too but there will be no one, no one impacted. Some of you people have lots that are 800 foot deep, your lot will stay 800 feet deep and on the other side there will not be tall parking lot lights or vapors as trucks back up to the loading dock. There will be fellow residents back there and not a lot of them. This probably, that area to the south we anticipate will be the lowest density development we have ever been engaged in. I think we are talking about 60 houses or 55 potential homes on nearly 70 acres. So that is less than 1 unit per acre. Typically the developments you see whether it be Waterford or Westwood Farms, that is 2 acres, 2 units or 2 ¼ units per acre so this is less than half that number of homes. I am not going to go back to my notes, I appreciate everybody's time, I appreciate everybody's consideration. With that I would like, Kristine perhaps you can fill in the blanks with everything I left out. Thank you.

Mr. Rinker – Kristin, I am not the IT guy but hopefully I will be able to get this. Here you go. Oppps, shoot, I want to go to . . . Is David around? So here is your report, yes I wanted to get it larger. Okay.

Ms. Hopkins – Is it okay to take my mask off?

Mr. Rinker – I think so yes. I think she wants a full screen.

Ms. Hopkins – I don't think you can, we're good, we're good. Good evening, my name is Kristin Hopkins, I am a Land Use Planner employed by CT Consultants. I have authored the report in conjunction with my coworker, David Hart and I would like to give you a little bit of background on our qualifications before I get started. David Hart and I have been working together for more than 20 years. He himself has over 50 years of experience as a Land Use Planner. He founded his own firm in 1979 and I joined him in the late 1980's and then in the early 2000's I left DB Hart and took a job with the Cuyahoga County Planning Commission doing things like working with local

communities, putting together Master Plans, drafting Master Plans like the one the County helped the City of Strongsville with. Then in 2014 CT Consultants purchased or merged with DB Hart and then David Hart gave me a call and asked me if I would come work with him again and so for the last 6 years he and I have been heading up the planning group at CT Consultants. Together we have worked on more than, worked with more than 200 communities in Ohio, mostly in northeast Ohio and his practice and my work at the County and with him has concentrated on Comprehensive Land Use Planning, Zoning Regulations mostly related to implementing the plan policies and then also about 25% or so of the work has been working with developers or private property owners and helping them lay out their projects and get their projects approved at the community level. So in one way or another we have been working with local communities maximizing their planning efforts through the collaborative aspect of Comprehensive Planning as well as then drafting and getting zoning regulations adopted. Through all of that, there are two things we strive for in our practice and that is; making sure that the plans, the Master Plans that are drafted are advancing, a valid public purpose and that there is a relationship between the regulations that end up getting drafted to advance that public purpose. There is a relationship between those regulations and that public purpose and that those regulations are reasonable and achieving the public purpose. In terms of then the work that he and I have done for this particular project, we had two goals in mind and one was; the first one was to analyze the existing industrial zoning as it is applied to this particular subject site which is a combination of 11 different properties and I believe 5 different owners, 5 or 6 and so looking at how the current zoning regulations relate to and impact this particular project and then also looking at the requested rezoning and what sort of benefits does that provide the City. How does that proposed zoning change relate to and compare with what is possible under the current zoning. So those were the two things we were looking at to do this review and prepare the report we looked at the, primarily the 2019 Master Plan to see how the Master Plan envisioned this area particularly but overall the City wide goals. Looked at the zoning code, the zoning regulations, the zoning map, where other GI, General Industrial zoning occurs, things like that. What sort of development has occurred recently, what have been the recent development trends both in the southwest corner of the City as well as in the region. Then looking at the developers conceptual plan which is important. We then did an estimate of tax revenue so in order to accomplish that we had to have some quantifiable information related to types of dwelling units, estimated value of those and whose likely to purchase those. So with that I'll go through the report and I know Bruce gave you a very good overview of all of the maps that are in the report. What I will try to do then, what I will focus on is giving the explanation for what we were looking at and what our findings were providing a little more detail than what he provided. Again, this is the subject site, in terms or existing conditions, then what we were looking at, as you can see on this map, two existing zonings the boundary that is shown here is the area that is zoned General

Industrial and then the areas that are white are the R1-75 single family, the areas in green are Public Facilities. So we looked at the zoning and we looked at it from the entire area from Rt 82, Royalton Road and along Prospect Road to the west down to Boston Road and then up Marks Road to look at and quantify and analyze what is going on from a zoning and a land use standpoint within that area. There are approximately 1,700 acres or land in this, what we are calling the southwest corner and when you look at the industrial zoning the purplish colored area compared to the white, the purple area is the GI zoning and that's about 84% of this entire quadrant area. As you can see from the land use map, residential zoning, both on the left and in the yellow land use area here abuts the GI zoning along the eastern boundary all the way down pretty much except for a few areas where you have the Public Facilities zoning that occurs for a fire station, a church that is right in here at the corner of Drake and Prospect and then some City ballfields. Also what you can see in this land use map then which all of the color coding, when you look I did a detailed analysis of the property records from the Cuyahoga County Auditor's Office and analyzed the land use and then looked also at the aerial photo to see how much of each property is developed. So the gray area is the vacant land, the blue is an industrial type of use, the red is a commercial type of use according to the County and then the pinkish color down here and there is a couple of other areas, those are office uses. So when you tally up all of the acreage in this southwest quadrant that is developed according to the "general industrial zoning" which does allow a range of manufacturing uses as well as commercial uses; there are approximately, approximately 500 almost 600 acres out of the, there are 1,450 or so acres that are zoned GI and out of that is about 600 acres that are developed in accordance or what the intent of the GI zoning district is. That is about 35% or so of the entire GI district. As was pointed out earlier, the green area in the center of this GI zoning, pretty much in the center is owned by the City of Strongsville, has been developed as the green shows for parks. This little triangular area is the municipal facilities but when you calculate all the land owned by the City it comes to about 146 acres in the GI zoning, zoned area and then when you consider the Public Facilities off to the east, that is another 22 acres. When you look at just the green area that is about 138 acres of park land. It was already pointed out, this is a sizeable amount of land in the GI zoning district that is basically pre-empting industrial development and is pretty much tax exempt in not paying property taxes. When we look at the gray area and calculate the gray area there are about 630 acres or so and that doesn't include parcels like this one here which is partly colored in blue, partly colored in gray. When we are looking only at entire parcels in land use, there are as I said 630 acres. The subject site down here is approximately 141 acres of GI zoning and then in this southwest corner is about 144 acres of vacant land also that are owned by the City. When you calculate the area that is in yellow that is approximately 315 acres of residential property, residentially used property. Two hundred and forty of these acres or so is zoned along the edges that are zoned R1-75. So, even though there is a lot of General Industrial zoning in this

area there is a considerable variety of land uses already in the area and as you can see from the gray, there is still quite a bit of vacant land that still exists. When we look at the General Industrial zoning and what that permits, the zoning district allows a wide range of manufacturing uses, offices, laboratories etc. but one of the things that is important to point out is that there is this expectation that it will generate a large amount of motor vehicle trucking, rail service and the transportation of raw materials and finished products. So that is the intent of the GI district and then there is this understanding in the zoning regulations that General Industrial and Residential uses, there should be some separation between them because of the potential negative impact on General Industrial. So then when you look at the GI setback requirements you can see that the, when properties abut residential districts there is a larger side yard, side setback so parking is 10 feet if it is nonresidential, 30 if it is up against residential. Rear setbacks 10 feet for parking, 30 feet again for parking abutting residential. However, one of the things that occurs in the Strongsville zoning and on the zoning map is this allowance for site specific setbacks so as Bruce has already pointed out, when we look at the area along the east and the south portion of the subject site these setbacks are significantly larger. So the parking setback is now at 200 feet not 30, and the building setback is now 400 feet not 100 and I will get into more detail on that and the impact of that later on. As Bruce also mentioned, you can see in this map which actually comes from the Cuyahoga County Green Print, the Master Plan has a similar environmental map too but this I thought was easier to see how much it impacts this property so, as you can see, cutting through, slicing you could say, the subject site into various areas that are separated by these ravines and wetland areas and as significantly, equally is the wooded area, that amount of wooded area that is in this area. Bruce has already talked about the roadway system and how the subject site is all the way to the south and if it were to develop for industrial would be required to travel up Foltz Parkway. I had given him some incorrect information in terms of it being a mile and a quarter or a mile and a third, it is actually from where this subject site would access Foltz Parkway it's actually 2 miles and then if you were to go from the subject site up Foltz Parkway and then across to I-71, that is about 5 miles and 1/4, 5 and 1/4 miles. Alright, so the next thing I wanted to cover is looking more specifically at the policies that are spelled out in the Master Plan and as Chris Bender has already pointed out, the City undertook this planning process, talked to a lot of people which is what planning processes should do and over the course of about 2 1/2 years put together the set of policies and in the whole intent of the Master Plan is to guide development over the next 10 or 15 years. Some of the things that I thought were interesting that I wanted to point out in the Strongsville Master Plan is that one of the things that is highlighted is the fact that the City is about 25 square miles and is primarily built out. Limited opportunity for new development and the main focus moving forward is how to plan as demands change and the community continues to grow. If you are primarily built out and later on it says there's no residential land available, that the residential zoning is pretty much entirely built out, then the only

way you are able to grow, if you are trying to keep a balanced community is to consider areas that should be rezoned. When we look at other aspects, guides and principals' one of the guiding principles is making sure that the City is protecting its economic base. However, when we analyze the GI zoned parcels north of Drake versus south of Drake it is clear that there are prime industrial sites that are north of Drake and the County points that out. The Master Plan points that out. However, throughout the Master Plan or in different areas of the Master Plan it does compare north of Drake Road with south of Drake Road and in various places talked about how Drake Road, GI zoned land south of Drake Road is better suited for other uses than industrial. And so in looking at how much vacant land there is south of Drake Road, there is over 350 acres of vacant land however, when you think about the where Foltz Parkway ends and how much space, how much land is below or south of that much of that area has no, none of the critical infrastructure of road and utilities to accommodate that industrial development, and there are no plans for the City to provide that infrastructure. Then as I pointed out, the Master Plan talks about residential land being built out and the only way you will accommodate new housing development which is advocated in the Master Plan is therefore to find land undeveloped land and rezone it from a nonresidential district to residential development and the Master Plan identified areas that are suitable for that including the subject site. The Master Plan also clearly says that the land area that is occupied, that the City uses for recreational purposes at Lunn Road and Foltz Parkway is prime industrial land and it's that it makes sense to move those recreation facilities south but even if the City weren't to move it it still makes sense to consider preserving that area south of, with that land area of the City and then, and our opinion as well, the subject site that it is reasonable to preserve it as open space and park land. The Master Plan as it was pointed out also stresses the need to eliminate split zoning. It basically says the split zoning eliminates any economic use of the rear portion of your property especially if it is zoned residential along the street frontage and not residential behind and that is because of the City's policy of not allowing access from, through residentially land to nonresidential land behind. Also, I would like to point out the area of that is to the east of the subject site is zoned R1-75 and the policy is that that are on the west side of Prospect Road was zoned R1-75 to be compatible with what is across that street on the east side, and then based on that rationale if the Master Plan recommends eliminating the split zoning and you want to preserve and protect that residential on the east side then the rationale would be that the entire area split zoned properties on the west side should be rezoned to R1-75. The Master Plan also talks about how areas of the City should be rezoned to be more consistent with the character of the surrounding area so Bruce had shown a map that identified that. The City property was identified as a piece of land that should be rezoned. I would argue that the land that is shown on appendix D as well for the multigenerational housing that this property, the subject site should be rezoned as well to be consistent with the surrounding character of the development. The Master Plan also has a goal that talks

about protecting the environment and it specifically talks about how a preserved and healthy environment can create a beautiful setting where people desire to live, and so it is important to point out that when we consider the best way to preserve the environment it is much easier to do that with residential development. The residential development does take advantage of and seize the natural environment as an asset compared to industrial development that would pretty much level and disturb the land, these natural features are seen as an impediment to development. The Master Plan talks about providing incentives, increasing green space requirements, continuing to enforce the City's tree preservation ordinance, all of this is best accomplished through residential development. Then we looked at some other what we are calling recent City positions so that's actions that the City has taken over the last 20 or 30 years. Again thinking about how the Master Plan talks about the City's goal is to protect the economic base yet when we look at what is gone on and the actions the City has taken over the last 20 or 30 years in this particular part of the City, it appears that the City has disregarded this economic development goal considering the things that have occurred in this area. For example, the land zoned GI has been significantly reduced and not available for industrial development through 3 distinct actions that we looked at. So these excessive setbacks that you have already heard about that reduces the development potential, and I have some data, a few pages further that actually show you how much it reduces that development potential as well as amendments to the zoning map where rezoning's have occurred and the GI land has been rezoned to a nonbusiness district and then there are, there's significant amount of land a significant portion of the GI zoned land that the City has acquired and has either developed for tax exempt public uses or has kept it in its ownership with the expectation of selling it sometime in the future but that's been 15 years or so. So when we look at the combined acreage of land that has been rezoned to a nonbusiness district in this area it is about 260 acres, and that is north of Lunn Road and when you look at that that is 37% of the area which we could arguably say is where the prime industrial zoned land is. When you consider how this land is then is now tax exempt and looking at the value of this property so the County does give you the valuation when we look at the total valuation it is roughly 14 million dollars or about \$89,000.00 an acre. So if that were private development there would be taxes being paid on that however, if it were in private development it's likely that it would have been developed as an industrial use which when we look at the value of industrial property in the vicinity its valued at more than 2.5 million dollars an acre which is paying then real estate taxes to the tune of \$67,000.00 an acre. So again that's what could have been if this land, this prime developable land were industrially developed. Furthermore as I mentioned the City purchased, acquired 169 acres in the southwest corner that you have already seen on the map back in 2002. What we have said in the report then is that this is a preemption of the use of these properties for economic development and that when you consider how the Master Plan suggests relocating these ballfields which would open up about

139 acres of land that the 139 acres of prime industrial land is almost the same amount of acreage that the subject site is, 141 acres. It also was mentioned, the City provides economic development incentives and actually on the website the City says it has aggressive local tax incentive policies for industrial development. In our opinion these tax incentives actually dilute the short term benefit of industrial development especially when considering that there is a potential for 100% tax abatement over up to 15 years. When we looked at the current land, industrially developed land in this southwest quadrant there are 66 developments in total of that over the last two decades 39 of those or 59, almost 60% of those developments have received some type of tax abatement. When we look at the amount of land and development that is currently tax abated, that is 31.4 million dollars that is listed in the County records as tax exempt or tax abated and not being, no taxes paid on that amount. So when we look at and consider what those property taxes would have been if that land were not tax abated, those buildings and building improvements, it's about \$76,000.00 a year in property taxes is not being paid to the City and \$475,000.00 a year not paid to the school district. So the next few items, pages are highlighting then how we arrived at some of these issues or what we looked at related to these factors that we consider actually reducing the development potential. There are 5 different things that affect this property, we've already covered the split zoning but what is interesting about the split zoning is that there are 11 parcels in the subject site, 9 of those parcels are impacted by the limitations imposed by the split zoning. Meaning that they cannot develop the back end, the GI zoned portion of the lot because of the frontage being residential. So there not, 109 acres of these 9 parcels and 91 acres or 83% of those individual parcels when you total it up, 83% is not usable because of the split zoning. Then we looked at the excessive parking and building setbacks and one of the things to think about is where these building and parking setbacks occur and there are, this entire southwest corner, I showed you the GI zoning area south of Royalton Road but there are also GI zoning north of Royalton Road in the Darice Parkway and Progress Drive. So nowhere else in the GI district is, are these extremely large setbacks, nowhere else are they applied. They apply only to property that is south of Drake Road, west of Prospect and north of Boston Road. So along Boston Road. So when we look at the impact that that has on the subject site itself the parking setback if you tally all that up, is 17 acres. If we apply to the typical 30 foot setback for parking adjacent to residential, that would comprise 2.5 acres so there is a significant amount, it ends up being almost 600% larger, the amount of land that is occupied or consumed and then also, when we look at the building setbacks, 34 acres was already mentioned, in contrast to what the standard setback is for 8.5 acres so that is about 300% larger. As Bruce had pointed out, that consumes almost a quarter percent of the site but in contrast if the standard setbacks were applied only 6% of the site would have been devoted to those setbacks. That is a significant amount of land that's not being put to good use to pay taxes on, to use for income tax purposes, things like that. In terms of the environmental and here is the map, so the

other thing that that does is it clearly splits the parcel and makes it even harder to do the, any sort of development on parcels that have no access opportunities to Prospect Road, Boston Road. In terms of the environmental features, you saw where, how the ravines and the wetlands impact that subject site but one of the things to point out is that, and why it doesn't work for or makes it hard to develop the site for industrial is, when you look at the development, the existing development on Commerce Parkway, this is pretty typical of how industrial development occurs. You have some 10 foot setbacks for the parking area and so parking pretty much 10 feet, up to 10 feet to the side and rear lot lines. There is more that, there is 100 foot front building setback but you can see that nearly all of the site that is developable outside of the parking setbacks, nearly the entire area is developed. In contrast when we think about the subject site and how it is impacted by the streams that cut through east to west and how it really chops up the land, we estimate that about 50 acres out of the 140 some acres is actually developable for industrial purposes because it would be so hard to find and create and contour the land to create pads, development parcels suitable for industrial development and so in typical industrial development now is 100,000 square feet of building. It was already talked about, this poor highway access. One of the things is that transportation infrastructure is a critical component for successful industrial development and especially in today's day and age where so much of the development is warehouse facilities which require easy access to Interstate Highways for transporting goods. As I already mentioned it is a significant 5 miles from the subject site and has to be funneled up through Foltz Parkway so that in and of itself when you are looking at vacant land at the end of the road so to speak, everything north of it is better suited than what is at the end of the road. Also, one of the things to point out is that the City's ban on truck traffic on Boston Road, Prospect Road and Marks Road, this precludes any sort of local distribution of products so even if you did have some industrial development at the south end and they were distributing things in smaller trucks, smaller vehicles this would not be possible so it is making it even harder for smaller businesses to locate in this southern area. One of the things too that is also the competition from improved industrial sites. I did an analysis of development that has occurred since 2006 and when we look at what has been developed it's all developed on what is considered improved sites so it's already, they are parcels that already front on a public road with water and sewer. The City of Strongsville as I mentioned, purchased 169 acres and the City recently sold a 23 acre parcel. It has almost 2,000 or 1,200 feet of frontage on Foltz Parkway. When you consider that based on the City's audit that was submitted to the State, the purchase price or the selling price was \$650,000.00, that is about \$24,000.00 an acre so if you are trying to compete with land that the City has to sell that is a very difficult, it is not very competitive for the private land owner especially when looking at the properties that transferred over the last few years, there was one development that transferred in 2017 and that was valued at about \$85,000.00 an acre and two transfers in the last year and those were selling at an average of \$160,000.00

an acre. So the 23, \$24,000.00 an acre for land sold by the City makes it difficult for a private property owner to compete. So in essence then looking at these 5 different factors in our opinion it makes it very difficult, cost prohibitive and unlikely that industrial will occur for a number of years. Mostly or it is our opinion that it is likely to be the last bit of land that would be developed and only occur as I said as additional or other vacant land north of it becomes or is developed first. The next, this next section actually then compares what the development potential is for the site. Thinking about the setbacks, the natural features and that and compares it with what the residential potential would be based on the conceptual plan that was included in the application. So based on our research, we used an estimate of about 8,000 square feet an acre and estimated there are about 50 to 55 acres of usable land that could be developed, which would generate around 420,000 square feet of building floor area and at about 6 employees per acre which is what is the current average in this industrial district, that would be about 250 employees. When we think about how though that is only on 50 to 55 acres of land and you distribute that that yield across the entire parcel, then we are looking at less than 3,000 square feet of development or square footage of building per acre which is considerably less than what the average is, so 37% of a typical 8,000 square foot per acre estimate. Then also thinking about how there are, there is only one way to get access to the site, the conceptual plan of development for industrial estimated at about 2,100 feet of roadway construction and utilities so that adds about \$75,000.00 an acre so that is just, that is the starting point and when you consider again how the City sold land for less than \$30,000.00 an acre, this site is not a competitive site for industrial development. Then what we look at the development potential for residential and how did that compare with what the master plan advocates and talks about and so thinking about how, as Chris pointed out there is a need for more diverse housing stock. Housing stock that will both attract and keep residents so keeping residents as people get older and they become empty nesters and they want lower maintenance housing, things like that, that adding this sort of multigenerational housing is an important factor in keeping Strongsville the attractive community that it is and a place where people will move to, want to move to and stay in as they get older. Then as I pointed out, without any vacant residential land available then the only way to accommodate this multigenerational housing is by rezoning land and so obviously from a City standpoint what you want to do is you want to find the least productive land, the land that is least productive for nonresidential purposes and then consider it for residential development. So, in looking at the kinds of things advocated by the Master Plan, what we have identified are these points as to why is this property suitable for residential development? So the first one is related to the ability of residential development with its smaller footprint, it is easier to let's say bob and weave as to how it fits on the site. So it is easier to preserve important natural features on the site. There are ways that you can design the houses so that the basements or a walk out basement and how you can design the street pattern and things like, there is a whole lot more

flexibility with residential development than with industrial development. As I mentioned before, with all of this extensive natural environment it becomes an asset, it makes housing more valuable and a more desirable place to live and so you're better able to then have higher priced housing and may get a really desirable residential development. Also with this flexibility and smaller footprints it's easier to incorporate the necessary storm water management practices. That not only would benefit this subject, this site but also properties that are down stream and then in thinking about the need for alternative housing options, this site being, as Chris pointed out, at the northern end there is some industrial development so this is a reasonable place to put this, these attached units or town homes because people who typically buy and are interested in town homes are not the kind of people who have a garden and a deck and a pool in their backyard. They are not, households and families that want that environment in their backyard are not going to be in the market for a town house. So this provides, this site provides an area that is well suited for that alternative housing and then as one of our final points then in terms of the economic use of the, residential development will enable maximum use of the site in contrast to the split zoning which now, those property owners are really only able to achieve a 17% use of their site. Then as I mentioned, the proposed mix will not have an adverse impact on existing single family homes because it's not it's not close to where they are, where the existing houses are along Prospect Road. Then just a couple of points related to the residential unit summary, these are the types of statistics that I needed in order to run the tax analysis, so the single family homes that are on the larger lots towards the south end of the subject site, those would have a sales price estimate of \$500,000.00 to \$650,000.00 and an average income for the household of about \$150,000.00. Then at the lower end of the townhomes, so those would be in the sale price of about \$325,000.00 and then we've estimated these average incomes and I would like to point out that because some of these houses are going to be age restricted, there is a certain percentage of homeowners that are likely to be no longer working, entirely retired and so these average incomes reflect a certain percentage of householders that will have no taxable income. Again these statistics are used for the tax assessment later on. Now I would like to switch and just talk about development, industrial development trends, starting, big picture regionally and how things have changed over the last let's say 100 years. When we think about when the subject site, it wasn't zoned probably 100 years ago but maybe 70 years ago when it was initially zoned and that was before I 71 and the Turnpike were completed and it was during a time where a lot of communities were rezoning or zoning land along State Routes like State Route 82, for these nonresidential uses and it made sense because we didn't really have a hierarchy of a transportation system like we do now. But now with the completion of I 71 and the Turnpike there is a significant interest now in being very close to the highway, shorter distances, there is a lot more truck traffic and goods are being moved about and so transportation as I said is a significant component of what industrial sites are looking for or industrial uses are looking for. Then so I would

also like to point out then, so this industrial zoning has been in place for roughly 70 years and less than 40% of what was originally zoned has been developed for industrial land. So taking that into consideration, how long will it take for the rest of the remaining vacant land to be developed. Then we looked at what is the County saying, you know what is the County Economic Development Department looking at in terms of its priorities for economic development. So this place based strategy this was done in about 2015 and it was acknowledging that there's been a big shift in economic development trends and thinking about global competition and how manufacturing has changed significantly, it's no longer a labor intensive type of of business and it is much more limited etc. so the County has actually taken, did this analysis to identify places where it itself was thinking it would focus its tax dollars you know the, their economic incentives and their economic push for the County as a whole. So as Bruce pointed out, Strongsville, even though Strongsville is on I 71 none of Strongsville is in this, in this purple area which is the strategic areas. Strategic areas for investment and the things that the County said that they were looking at when they identified these areas is they were looking for places where there already were target industries. The industries that the County felt had the most potential for growth in the future. As well as where existing job concentrations already occurred and so as you can see they are concentrated along highways but not along, not all along highways in concentrated areas. Then we looked at industrial reports that are published on a quarterly basis, we looked at what was available over the last 6 years or I am sorry from 2016, so the last 4, 4 ½ years or so. Just to see what the Cleveland Region has been doing, what has been going on and so the statistics with this, the Region is that there has been a significant amount of construction but it has been dominated by warehousing and distribution operations so 60% there has been, there currently are almost 364 million square feet of industrial space and 60% of that is warehouse and distribution and then modern bulk activity is, as I said, greater than 100,000 square feet, that is the kind of development that's primarily occurring. So when you think about the kind of users who are fueling that sort of development, its Amazon fulfillment centers is a good example of the big users. When we think about where Amazon centers have occurred, they are in Euclid, North Randall, Twinsburg, this year, last year I mean they were announced to build in Cleveland, Bedford Heights, Glen Willow, Akron. These locations support what these industry reports have said is that these warehouses are primarily concentrated in the southeast and northern portion of Summit submarkets. So, they're, and it is not occurring to any great extent in the southwest or along the I 71 corridor and not in the submarket that is the one that Strongsville is in. So, actually when you look at this chart which is looking at industrial absorption and completion, so these are industrial construction trends and absorption rates, since 2016, this represents the entire Cleveland regional market. This is the southeast submarket and so there has been some variability as well as in the Summit County Submarket but overall the southeast submarket has since 2016 added 2.2 million square feet of new construction that has

been absorbed and in the Summit County its 2.17 million square feet that has been absorbed and together these two areas, they account for over 60% of net absorption in the Cleveland region. When we look at what is going on in the southwest submarket and you add up the amount of building that has been absorbed compared to amount of buildings that have been constructed and what the vacancies that are already existing there actually has been a decline by almost 180,000 square feet so considerably different set of construction experience facts occurring in the southwest compared to along the southeast in some markets. So when we think then about how easy is it for the subject site to compete in the region overall, we looked at what is the potential for development in the submarket, first before I go on to that though I did want to point out that not only has the amount of land declined or amount of net absorption is minus 180,000, the average vacancy rate for the southwest submarket, that is out of about 10 different submarkets has been the highest for the last, since 2018 so averaging 7% compared to 5.6 for all of Cleveland. Then when we, when I gathered the data from Team Neo on the amount of vacant and available land, which is down under number 2 and compared it to the amount of vacant floor area that is reported by the industrial reports, there is the potential for, in this entire region, there is the potential for between 58 million and 93 million square feet of additional floor area. When we look at the overall absorption rate at about 1.4 million square feet a year, that translates into about 55 to 80 years for the vacant land and the vacant square footage to be fully developed and utilized. And again, what is important about this is that there is a relatively small amount of land in the southwest corner of Strongsville, 660 acres or so and then if you translate the vacant square footage to acres you are less than 700 acres and you are competing with sites, many sites that are much closer and more attractive for industrial development. And in addition to that, because of the amount of automation that is occurring and the increasing building efficiencies, the manufacturing jobs are only expected to continue to decline so another 6% or so over the, up until the 2026 or so. We did then look at what's actually happened in the southeast corner of Strongsville so the GI zoned land, the hundred and some, 1,400 acres of land to see what has been occurring over the last, we looked at since 2006 because that was the County has aerial photos so it is easy to see where development has occurred. There have been two kinds of development, one is undeveloped sites have been developed with brand new buildings and then there has been expansion. So, since 2006 there have been 8 new sites or 85 acres that have been consumed and developed since 2006. When we look at that entire time since 2006 that amounts to about 6 ½ acres a year or about 70,000 square feet of new development a year. During that same period there were 11 parcels, 11 existing facilities that expanded their building floor area and added an average of 17,000 square feet per year. What is interesting about that is that there, that also includes a time frame where there was an economic crisis in 2008 to 2009 or so and then the effects of that lingered. So, when we look at what's occurred in the last 3 years of new development, there were 3 sites that were developed and if you look at just the

square footage added in those 3 sites then that was an absorption of about 12 acres a year so if we take the 6 ½ as an average from 2006 versus the 12 acres a year more recently the full buildout of the about 630 acres of vacant land, it would take between 50 and 95 years which is also the same as what it is for the entire region. And so this is where we were able to identify where these new construction, these new sites occurred. We also know that there were two sites, this is the site that the City sold, the 23 acres and development has been approved. There is another site up, off of Commerce Park that is going to, or that includes extending the roadway. The green area that is all of the sites that have new construction. The expansion of the existing facilities is hard to see, it is these little areas highlighted in orange, but one of the things that is very evident in looking at this is they are all along, except for this one that was approved recently, everything else has frontage on an existing street, has utilities available and will, did not incur the same type of development costs that the subject site would incur trying to develop the site and market it and sell it for industrial development. So that is a significant distinction between the 140 some acres of industrial zoned land down here compared to everything else that has been developed recently. Alright, so we are right at the end, looking at the most important feature I guess or analysis you could say and that is related to the tax revenue estimates comparing full buildout that, of the 420,000 square feet or so of industrial development and the roughly 247 residential houses that were shown on the conceptual plan and to compare the two to see what, if they were both to be developed side by side at the same time, what would the difference look like. Now what this table is assuming is that the entire 420,000 square feet of industrial development would get tax abatement for building improvements. So what we are looking at is the existing real estate taxes right now that this industrial land, vacant industrial land pays about 60 total, pays about \$65,000.00 a year which is just under \$6,000.00 a year for City real estate taxes and then \$36,000.00 for the school district. In comparison then, when we look at what the 247 house would generate based on the values that were provided they're significantly higher so this 1.4 almost 1.5 million dollars that Chris mentioned for the school district in real estate taxes and the \$235,000.00 in real estate taxes to the City. The bottom line then when you look, oh and then we have the income taxes and so we did estimate, as I mentioned earlier, 250 some employees at a annual wage of about \$66,000.00 and then when you look at what the income tax that would be generated you see then adding that the income tax that is on this line here which, yes the industrial development does generate higher income taxes but when you add that to the real estate taxes then the residential development does generate more, both from the city side, real estate, income taxes as well as a significantly higher amount for the school taxes. Again, based on the 15 year abatement that we are assuming. To tie it all together related to the absorption rate, this, that's what this Table 11 is looking at, finally, okay if you do the development and it is residential development when is it likely to occur, how long is it going to occur. So as Chris mentioned he anticipates about a 5 year time frame in terms of getting

construction under way and finished so over the next 15 year then we are looking at full build out by year 6 assuming that year 1 is getting approvals so this is where you, we arrived at the 17.7 million dollars for the school district total over those 15 years and 5.5 million total for the City revenue. When we think about the industrial development and when is it likely that this property would be developed, we took a very optimistic view and said ok if this property were available and how quickly could it be developed. Well there is a significant amount of vacant land but let's say the City or let's say over the next 12 years there could be some absorption the equivalent of the 12 acres a year which is really about what the City's land totals. We plugged in some number then so at that same rate of about 12 acres a year then by the time 15 years goes by we would have 75% of the development, industrial development under way and it would be generating between 580 million or \$580,000.00 total for the 15 years for the City and a little less, \$546,000.00 total for the 15 years for the school district. So when you compare them side by side that is a significant difference in the expectation in the short term, in the next 15 years. Until, just one last thing I would like to point out in relation to what these numbers tell us and what the market is expected to support and its supported by the Master Plan is that, and Chris made a comment about the school district and how important the school district is, when you consider how, if the City holds on to this property and this property doesn't get developed for 12 years, more likely much longer than that, the amount of taxes that could be generated for the school district and the fact that the project is expected to attract householders who have fewer kids and the expectation that they, that many many Strongsville residents will age out of their current house and be potential buyers for this development that by continuing to have significant revenues for the school district that keeps the City itself an attractive place and so as people move out and into this development you do have buyers ready and waiting to move into Strongsville. So with that I'll turn it back over.

Mr. Rinker - That concludes our presentation, we appreciate it and we know it's been long but we felt the details were important.

Mr. Kolick – Mr. Rinker, maybe you can keep up, Chis and Kristen up by the microphone.

Mr. Rinker – Yes I kind of figured you would want to do that.

Mr. Kolick – Any questions then can be addressed to any of the, whomever would be the right person to answer, go ahead.

Mr. Roth asked to be able to speak.

Mr. Kolick – Mark, we can't take any questions from the public this is just for the City officials.

Mr. McDonald – Thank you, we appreciate the presentation and appreciate the information. Let's just go around the room from a Commission standpoint and any questions that we have we will get those on the floor. Let's start with Mr. Pfahl.

Mr. Pfahl – Yes, just to clarify, the, let's see, I have a lot of notes here this evening. The Master Plan that was developed a couple of years ago, I think 2019, generally that is to be considered a suggestion and a guide right, for a City to look at and see and use it as a guide to where they want to be in the future, am I correct?

Mr. Bender – I believe that is correct.

Ms. Hopkins – That is but I would say that the amount of time and money and human capital that you put into it, you do it for a reason and so you want to make sure that you are making use of your time and resources and putting together a good plan because there is no reason to do a plan unless it is meaningful to you and you plan on implementing it.

Mr. Pfahl – Right and this is, the Master Plan is that guide to help us to do that, is that correct?

Ms. Hopkins – That is correct.

Mr. Pfahl – Maybe Chris you could answer, okay this land has been vacant and what has been the interest from industry coming into the City, have they looked at it, how many in the last 5, 10 years.

Mr. Bender – I have gotten sporadic comments, generally what I have found it's been realtors looking for a listing. There was a little more activity probably 2 or 3 years ago and I think that was the wave of Amazon and so on and so forth because what I had found out since is the realtors were putting together packages and they had to propose numerous sites so they had quote their favorite sites where they knew they had a better chance but they had to fill out their offering I guess you might say and so I was asked numerous time, one of them actually got a little further and asked me could I have my engineers send them a current topo. I sent them the topo, I called them back and they said, we are not interested which is pretty consistent when you are wanting to build a warehouse building, this property doesn't really fit. You know, I think that and the access has been the issue which has caused diminished return but significant

approaches, no not really. Nothing that ever got to the point of even a face to face meeting or proposal or a letter of intent, merely miscellaneous phone calls.

Mr. Pfahl – Maybe just one last question then, with the City have you had discussion with your plan, the moving of the recreational area to that site to the west? Has that been brought up with the City and have you discussed that and where does that stand?

Mr. Bender – Well that's interesting that you mentioned that. I had that discussion, I guess it would be approximately 15 years ago with the late Mayor Ehrnfelt. His response to me at the time was, yeah that is a great idea now, he said the problem is we've gotten a lot of grants to put those facilities in and we have to pay back the money so probably now it is not feasible. I understood his position, okay, but certainly in light of the way things have gone, the cost of extending improvements to the south, grants are probably paid for or are certainly with this administration with their great connections that they have with Columbus there are some grants still outstanding or are in that workout period, a waiver or something else but it is something that I did discuss with the Mayor. It was many years ago, I think it was always in the back of your mind, is you drive by that, you see that wonderfully graded, cleared drainage, the City Engineering Department and Service Department did an excellent job over the years of preserving that land and taking care of the issues but it is the spot where you could, somebody that wants contiguous acreage, it is ready to go, boy that is the spot, we would have to move the bleachers and things like that but the south end of town I think, is pointed out by this report by the County, I think highlights it.

Mr. Pfahl – Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McDonald – Thank you, Mr. Veris.

Mr. Veris – Just one question at this point, the Planning Commission received written declarations, I believe it was dated about August 4, 2020 opposing the rezoning request and signed by 47 residents of Ward 4. The Commission also received letters from a number of citizens expressing reasons why they opposed the rezoning request and among the items listed, and I could run through them, but the one that I noted was concerns about increased flooding due to elevation and flow of water off the new homes that would be built. How will your, I think you touched upon it a bit, how will your project or planned project belie their concerns.

Mr. Bender – I really appreciate, I truly do appreciate that question, I should have sent it in myself. This property and we have the City Engineer and Assistant City Engineer here in the audience this evening and they are very familiar with not only the City's property but the other issues and drainage and storm issues throughout the whole City

particularly the southwest section, okay. And I am not an engineer I am actually an accountant.

Mr. Kolick – Hey Chris, if you could continue to speak into the microphone, I know you are addressing him but it is the only way we can pick it up for our recording, thanks.

Mr. Bender – I am glad you asked that question, I am as I said and accountant not an engineer but basically this land, all water, all drainage on this land flows to the west, slightly northwest but for the most part to the west. The elevation of this land is considerably lower than Prospect Road. So much so that many years ago and I guess it is probably 20 years ago, I extended the sanitary sewer from Drake Road about I don't know, 3 miles south on Prospect and I have been advised that unfortunately most of this property cannot drain into that sanitary sewer because Prospect Road is higher. So we have to go out the back, go the west, the natural flow of the land. So all storm water, all streams on this property flow to the west. Where there is a real silver lining here is, the fact that all the water wants to come to us through our property, we have many many requirements to retain the storm water and release it at the same rate that we are accepting water. In this case, if we work with the City and I think the City has been excellent to work with over the 30 years I have been working with them, we work together, we can exceed the normal retention and detention on our property because we've got valleys, we've got, we're going to put large lots there, we don't have a lot of small lots, but we've got to maximize the number of them. So we can increase our retention, detention and we can hold that water slowly release it to the west and hopefully improved the water issue, discharge issue for not only the City but the other property owners to the west of us and hopefully improve the whole situation. Generally if you follow the whole system of drainage here, this water is designed by God, working its way over to Rocky River. So it's going due west and our hope would be that we could maybe slow it up a bit and improve things for the neighbors to the west. If it is done properly it can be an amenity. I know maybe you are familiar with Westwood Farms for example, we have numerous ponds and lakes in there and they end up being an amenity not a distraction.

Mr. Veris – No further questions at this time.

Mr. McDonald – Thank you, Mr. David.

Mr. David – Thank you Mr. Chairman. First of all I just wanted to thank you guys for obviously a lot of effort and it's gone to this point and there is a lot to consider and I just wanted to make that clear and to everyone that we're, we want to understand everything we can about this because when it comes down to it, you are asking the Planning Commission and the City to really change a long term vision of the City and

yes there are factors that can change that and we have to consider those things but the Master Plan does also advocate in many locations that I saw the importance of protecting and preserving our business parks so there is a lot that we have to think about. So, two real questions that I want to make sure I am clear with; the property has been owned since the 1970's is that what I heard before?

Mr. Bender – Yes, what we refer to as the James Way property so that is about 73 acres, that is the 3 large parcels that have connectivity to Boston Road. Those were purchased I believe it was 1981, 1982 and then the other major piece of property is what we refer to as the Sprague property. Mr. Sprague, part of the history here in town, that was his last farm and he sold us that probably 20 years ago and he continued to farm it because that is what he did for a few years and it has really laid dormant for the last 10 years or so. There are several small parcels that, that is not going to illustrate it, (indicating a map) 5 acre parcels, one is owned by Sophia Katakos who is in the audience and there area three parcels owned by Mr. Swan who lives there, who is a resident here in Strongsville, long term but is not here this evening. Then there is a 15 acre parcel that is owned by the Karim family, long time Strongsville residents, they are now retired and they basically bought this property over 20 years ago visualizing it and its potential use for funds for retirement. They are now reaching retirement age. Mr. Karim's property and the properties we own are the ones we are proposing the development on. Ms. Katakos's property as well as Mr. Swan's properties have joined us in the petitions as relative to their properties because they really can't do anything with the split zoning. They would like to potentially develop them some day and add them to our residential development but we have not included them because we don't have a contract, we don't have any contracts to buy their property, hopefully we may come to some agreement at some future date but not at this time.

Mr. David – Okay and if I am not mistaken I thought I saw on the east side that there was industrial zoning that would be landlocked if this were to go through.

Mr. Bender – That one long parcel there?

Mr. David – Yes, what's been considered with that?

Mr. Bender – That is a lady who I know is, I don't personally know her, she has lived on Prospect for a very very long time, I would say 40 years or probably better. I've made numerous attempts to contact her, I have made numerous attempts to contact her daughter telling them that we would at our cost include any preparation, we would include them if they wanted to join the petition, such as the other property owners did. But unfortunately we have received no response. I did get one comment back third hand I guess you would call it. It said, well if the rezoning goes we'll probably just sell

our property. Nobody has to sell their property, she can, right now she can't build on it, it will remain exactly the same, she can sell it to somebody else in the future, I can include it in the development, her options are wide open but of course her options improve tremendously versus what she has today. There is no intent to in any way to force, as I said earlier, no one needs to sell their property unless they want to sell their property.

Mr. Kolick – Chris, I think he is referring to not only that long lot but then where you've the marking there, that is it that Kristen is on, all those lots then would be landlocked because they would have residential to the north, residential to the south, residential to the east and residential to the west.

Mr. Bender – Yes, I understand.

Mr. Kolick – That is what I think he's referring to.

Mr. Bender – Okay, I will address that then. It is true, but they are no worse off with this rezoning then without this rezoning because they're landlocked because of split zoning now and as has been pointed out, they also are in this no man's land right now with the zoning map. If you look at the required setback for building and this is the pink area. Administratively they are landlocked now because they can't build on a commercial, because they can't take commercial traffic onto Prospect Road through their industrial but they can't further the use of their industrial property, I am sorry residential property because they bump into the industrial zoning. So that would be something that the City certainly could seek to rezone it, they could seek to rezone it on their own but I don't think their utilities are improved or diminished in any way by this activity or this request I should say.

Mr. David – Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Bender – Was that a significant answer there?

Ms. Hopkins – I would like to make one follow-up comment too. In regard to the question about the storm water, or flooding issues. So, I would say that if the City were to retain the industrial zoning with the expectation that it will ultimately be developed for industrial uses then you have to compare the impact on storm water management, you have to compare industrial development to residential development, you can't compare a requested rezoning and residential development compared to no development on the site. So it is important to keep that in mind.

Mr. Bender – The other comment that I have been forced to learn and I am going to mispronounce it impervious surfaces, I think I have pronounced that correctly, I can't spell it but you know, obviously commercial development has large flat roofs, has large parking lots, hard surfaces whereas in a residential there is a percentage that is much much lower which allows hopefully some of this water to percolate into the soils and control flooding in the future.

Mr. McDonald – Great, thank you. Mr. Schonhut.

Mr. Schonhut – Thank you sir, Chris did, my biggest focus with you is with how you got to that there would only be 420,000 square feet of industrial development because if you look at some of the different graphs that you gave us and such and just really focusing on really the northern piece of the subject parcel that we are here to discuss is approximately 63 acres that you want to take from General Industrial to cluster zoning. Cluster zoning is going to be very dense and going to require a very flat easily developable land, which I believe that is, to the north. I believe a lot of it is actually farm land so based off of some of your graphs here that say that we have anywhere between 10,000, 132 square feet to 10,806 square feet on average per acre of General Industrial zoning, just that piece to the north would exceed that 420,000 square feet no even including the two thirds of the rest of the development to the south. So how did you get to the 420,000 square feet?

Ms. Hopkins – I am sorry, I was listening to you but I am trying to go through my graph or my table that identifies, so, what, actually the engineer, the project engineer analyzed the topography on the entire site and took into consideration the setbacks as well as the road, the difficulty in getting a roadway through this site, so this part of the parcel is relatively easy to develop but then getting across the stream and then creating a pod, a developable site for industrial along here and along here and all that, that is again based on analysis of a general analysis based on the topography and other sites, that is where we arrived at the 50 to 55 acres of usable land after you take out whatever the roadway would be and then the implications of the setbacks.

Mr. Schonhut – Do you have that information that you could provide to us by chance?

Ms. Hopkins – Yes we can submit that.

Mr. Bender – That is Councilman Schonhut so he can be reached at the City offices.

Ms. Hopkins – Okay, alright.

Mr. Schonhut – I just think that number is low in my opinion based off of what other information that you gave to us so I am just curious as to how you arrived at that because obviously looking at the financials of everything that has a big impact on it.

Ms. Hopkins – Right, so so you were comparing it though to some of the data on the other development sites, other sites that have been developed?

Mr. Schonhut – Well you gave us data off of page 25, Table 8 that provided that from new development and expansion developments 2006 inventory, approved development 2020's, so you gave us that.

Ms. Hopkins – Right, but I would say that the sites that we looked at and let me, I'll go to that, so this map here actually identifies where these developments have occurred and so you are looking at say this parcel here and this parcel here which are easy to develop almost the entire site so that is similar to what I showed.

Mr. Bender – I would refer to those as that Mills Moving sites which were flat, clear, buildable, Wayfair is in one of our warehouses now.

Mr. Schonhut – Would you agree that the northern most parcel of your site that you have in front of us, the 63 acres that you want to take to RT-C is generally flat?

Mr. Bender – Except for the southwest portion of it, there is a very large ravine on the southwest portion, probably the deepest of the ravine is on the southwest portion of that parcel.

Ms. Hopkins – And some wetlands.

Mr. Bender – There are some wetlands on that property as well. And then the biggest limiting factor, quite honestly as I looked at this, was the required setbacks. The red area if you will on the previous drawing, because that forces us, that is residential along Prospect so those restrictions then forces back, is it 300 feet and 500 feet?

Ms. Hopkins – Two hundred and Four hundred.

Mr. Bender – So, I believe your calculations are then based on the net remaining land after you took the ravine out, after you took the parking setbacks out.

Mr. McDonald – Mr. Schonhut, if I could help, you have this number in our presentation, you have it on the screen, it is on page 19. It indicates that if development were to occur, comparable to recent proposed development in this location at 8,000 square feet

per acre the yield at full development would be 420,000 square feet. Is that the question you had Matt? How did they get to 420,000 square feet? And am I answering the question correctly based on the information you presented?

Mr. Schonhut – I just, I guess I don't understand how they got that at different numbers than the other table is.

Mr. McDonald – So according to this, it is strictly based on recent proposed development in this location.

Mr. Schonhut – Proposed but not other ones.

Mr. McDonald – Correct.

Ms. Hopkins – So, if I may, you are referring to page 25 and the analysis of what has occurred on Table 8 in terms of the 10,000 square feet of average per acre.

Mr. Schonhut – Correct.

Ms. Hopkins – And so, yes when you look at the 85 acres, the 8 sites and the 85 acres and you take the building floor area that was constructed and you get almost 11,000 square feet of building floor area and you get almost 11,000 square feet of building floor area but again when you look at the sites that have been developed, you are looking at a site like this, a site like this so they are maximizing the acreage.

Mr. Schonhut – Correct, and that's why I asked if you believe if the northern most portion of that parcel is also flat and easily developable.

Ms. Hopkins – It is flatter and more easily developable but as Chris said it is impacted by a stream and some wetlands and these building and parking setbacks which as you can see these interior lots don't, they are not impacted by that, they have a 10 foot side yard and rear yard setback for parking as opposed to 200 feet.

Mr. Schonhut – So if those setbacks were changed would you be more inclined to keep that General Industrial?

Mr. Bender – I'm sorry was that for me?

Mr. Schonhut – Yes.

Mr. Bender – Councilman, I would say, given all the other issues with the accessibility of the area in general with the competition posed by the City's ownership of so much land at such a lower basis, economically it still wouldn't make sense. You would get a little bit more buildable area but I don't know that it enhances or improves the general presentation.

Mr. Schonhut – Okay and one last question, Chris, when you did all your financial analysis based off revenue, were there any cost analysis done as it relates to industrial versus residential, city services that need to be provided to residential versus General Industrial?

Ms. Hopkins – No, we did not look at that.

Mr. Schonhut - Okay, that is all I have.

Mr. McDonald – Great, thank you Mr. Schonhut. Okay, Chris earlier I think Mr. Pfahl asked the question about what activity you have seen over the years of people coming to you for the development of this property as it remains today, GI. What has your organization done to actively promote this acreage as General Industrial acreage?

Mr. Bender – We've never listed the property. We've never prepared a sales brochure on the property, okay, mainly because of the obstacles that present themselves, the setbacks, the abutment to the residential neighborhood and quite frankly I had numerous discussions with not only the current Economic Development Director but also Mr. Magocky who proceeded him, as to hey we had this property here and Mr. Magocky particularly would ask me, what do you guys think you want to do with it. I said to him, I know you have a big user, somebody that wants to buy the whole thing? He said I wished I did, he said I've got 200 acres sitting here myself right now. So, for us to do any, spend a great deal of money knowing that we had those impediments, quite frankly did not make a lot of business sense.

Mr. McDonald – Okay, a couple of the concerns that I heard today from a financial standpoint with respect to the excessive setbacks on the south side of Drake, the 400 feet and 200 feet, have you done anything to apply to the City for variances to those setbacks?

Mr. Bender – No.

Mr. McDonald – And what about seeking financial support from the State or the County to help develop the infrastructure and the roads so that it could be developed industrial?

Mr. Bender – Well I think conversely we've done the opposite. We've taken the property on two different occasions to the Board of Tax Appeals explaining that because of the split zoning, because of the terrain, because of the lack of marketability, the property was not properly assessed and both times we were flatly rejected. So, I guess based on that we never really pursued an action. Let me go back, in all the business activity we've done, we have never asked for any abatement, tax breaks, grants or other assistance from any governmental body. So for us to do that would have been out of character for us to do it.

Mr. McDonald – Okay, thank you. I have a question, it is really just about expectations, I understand the flooding issue that was brought up, that Mr. Veris brought up and you mentioned that and we have petitions and letters from about 50 residents that seem to but up against this area. Regardless of the storm water issues, because I am confident that Engineering can manage that through the process, the expectations that the residents had of this land when they bought their properties is that the properties behind them were going to be General Industrial and now we are going asked to take an action to change that. As the same time we have businesses that bought properties in the industrial park expecting that the property was going to remain industrial and now we are asked to take an action to change to change that to residential. How do we address that with the constituents and the businesses that had one expectation coming in when they purchased their properties?

Mr. Bender – Well I think to me it's the very fact that whether it is a Planning Commission, whether it is a Master Plan study or whatever, I think it is a flexible thing. It is based on demand, times change. When I moved to Strongsville in 1974 Pearl Road was a two lane road from Rt. 82 to the County Line. It was exactly two traffic lights, may have only been one, I think there was one at Drake and it was only a flashing caution light at Shurmer but I have sat in this room many nights when properties have been approved and zoning had been changed and setbacks have been changed for all of those properties. I sat through all the various meetings having to do with the mall and the other retail properties on Rt. 82 and it was demonstrated that what may have been at one time, where the Mall is was a farm. Hingcliff's owned that, they made pallets, they had a couple of warehouse buildings where they made pallets, but as times changed and in this case we are talking about 70 years, the needs and the situation for the residents is different than it was then so I think that that is a concern. I don't, nobody is asking for anybody that is on Drake Road to change those setbacks. We'll, this Planning Commission will impose setbacks on this property when we come before you for development. As far as the residents go further down the road on Prospect, again, right now they are in never never land. They have industrial property behind their property that they can't really utilize and they can continue to have that same property that they can't utilize, nothing we are doing affects that. I honestly think

that they should rezone to residential along with us and at some point in time whether that is 10 years from now or 30 years from now they will have marketable real estate in their back yard. But there is certainly no need to do it now if they don't want to do it now but things do change that is the purpose of the Planning Commission, that is the purpose of Comprehensive Plans as I understand it.

Ms. Hopkins – If I may comment too, on the one hand the City is asking if the developer would request variances so then I would ask also if these setbacks, if these extremely large and selective setbacks were put in place at the request of these residential property owners for their expectation of industrial development being pushed 200 and 400 feet further away then is there a reasonable expectation that the City would grant variances to those excessive setbacks so that the parking is only 10 feet away? I don't know so, I think it's difficult to advocate that the property owners request variances on the site, at the same time saying that these residents expected industrial development because the question would be did they expect industrial development that is 400 feet further away.

Mr. McDonald – Sure I understand and again, nothing happens without a conversation so my question was regarding was there a conversation, was there a thought about trying to address that? And I think leaving a landlocked parcel of GI land in center of that is going to be more restrictive than the current setback issues that we have too because we have, we will have virtually eliminated that use of that land through zoning now by being able to use that parcel.

Ms. Hopkins – So so the point is that even if this area, if the subject site were developed for industrial and it did not encompass any of this land and it were still zoned industrial, they have even less ability to develop this land. Right now it's almost this industrial, this is the industrial zoning line right here so everything that is right here in this pinkish color is parking and building setback.

Mr. McDonald – Okay and that assumes that the lots stay as they are designed today.

Ms. Hopkins – Yes but if this, if the subject site were developed so that all of this land that is currently zoned industrial, if all this were developed industrial and this stayed residential, where is this land going to get access? There is no access, if all of this industrially zoned land were developed. If the subject site were developed.

Mr. Kolick – I think Kristen, what he is saying is that if that was zoned and developed industrial, the industrial could move further west because of where that access from its west side, yes they would have to change the setbacks but at least the land wouldn't be landlocked from a zoning standpoint, not a setback standpoint but from a zoning

standpoint because at least they would have access to those properties from the west and that is presuming the properties to the west stayed as GI.

Ms. Hopkins – That is presuming the subject site were developed with access that granted access to those parcels that are not part of the subject site.

Mr. Kolick – But right now, I think what the Chairman is saying is if you leave that area zoned GI it's completely circled by residential. Right now it's not completely encircled by industrial and again, leaving the setback issue aside a minute but it has GI to its west so it is not landlocked from a zoning standpoint, that is what he is suggesting.

Ms. Hopkins – And I understand that but I guess, I guess you have to consider the fact that you have property owners right now who are proposing a development and so if they were to propose an industrial development, using the land that they've got contracts on or own.

Mr. McDonald – We have property owners right now that have an expectation that the land be General Industrial and they are concerned about the change of it being over to residential based on the documentation that we have before this Commission.

Mr. Bender – If I may, I don't think I necessarily will get any answers but I should maybe get an answer is, I don't understand their expectation, I think the expectation of the property owners from the conversations and the conversations that I have been told, they just want it to stay treed they want it to stay wooded, okay and they are furious that if the land that we've proposed is rezoned to residential, right now their use of the land is kind of a private reserve, will dissipate. Again, yes that is probably true but the fact of the matter is you've had free use of it for these years, we've paid our taxes on the property and we are entitled to use our property and we're attempting to propose a development which is the least intrusive upon them and will actually benefit the value of their properties not only now but in the future, but I really, the limited feedback I've gotten and I had seen the 46 letters, I really don't think these people anticipate that they would like to see industrial development in their back yard. That is hard for me to understand.

Mr. McDonald – Let me ask one more question.

Mr. Rinker – I would like to respond, the question that was asked was, was there ever a request for variances and historically the answer is yes. There were two property owners that ended up having to go to Court with the City because the City defended those setbacks even the one property owner had their property entirely within the no build setback zone and claimed that the City basically was depriving them the ability to

develop their land and their neighbors on Prospect objected to those variance requests that they be able to use that property. So if the City is now saying after historically defending, after legislating those setbacks that would be a significant departure that would be anomalous. So I don't think it is fair to assume that the City can return what it has taken away. True it's a legislative determination but so is zoning, so the legislative policy of the City has consistently been, you cannot build on those rear portions. So the property owners who own the residential on Prospect have an expectation that there would be no development. So I think that is the other side of the coin, yes it's true they expect it to remain, General Industrially zoned but with the understanding that it won't be developed until you get beyond the setbacks and I think that is a fair characterization of the history of Strongsville with these setbacks.

Mr. McDonald – Thank you. So one other question, regarding the finances, can we put up Table 10?

Ms. Hopkins – What page it that on?

Mr. McDonald – It was your finances where you showed a 1.4 million and annual school district real estate taxes. Yeah, that's it (indicating a slide). So I think one of these questions was already asked by Mr. Schonhut when you looked at the benefits of residential development, the cost of social services wasn't factored in as part of that, correct?

Ms. Hopkins – That is correct.

Mr. McDonald – And I am assuming the cost to educate additional students is not factored into this either. The 1.4 million is pure revenue going to the district.

Mr. Bender – That is correct.

Mr. McDonald – So, at about \$14,000.00 a student I think is what it costs to educate a student in Strongsville. If you have one student in each of those 247 homes, you are actually showing a net loss of 1.5 million dollars.

Mr. Bender – Mr. Chairman, I did speak to the school treasurer about this, it has been some months ago and with the COVID and so on and so forth we have not revisited that situation but the number I believe that you stated is reasonably correct but that is an all in cost. That is all infrastructure that is all overhead that is his own salary, this is the Superintendent's salary. The comment was made to me that they would anticipate given the product mix that there may be 100 to 125 students but that the infrastructure could very easily absorb it so from a cost accounting standpoint, the indirect cost are

already accounted. They are already in the overhead situation, okay. For example, it is pretty obvious if the, you expand any business, you expand the Police Department, you don't expand the whole overhead, you can take on that one additional person and that was what was explained to me. The baked into there at \$14,000.00 a student is all the overhead, they are not going to add another Director of Curriculum, they are not going to have to add another Director of Transportation that they have the overhead. As a matter of fact, the system has decreased in size, so therefore the overhead is, the infrastructure is probably larger than ideal at this point and they felt they could absorb the students.

Mr. McDonald – So when I look at the school finances, of the \$14,000.00 per year per student, there is about \$2,000.00 allocated towards capital improvements and capital infrastructure, the rest is allocated towards instruction and student instruction. So that's probably the piece that is going to be impacted by the additional load on the students going through the schools and even with that being said, even with 100 students, you are still going to be almost at a net loss to the school system by bringing in additional students. Now maybe we should get a better analysis by the school district as to what that is, if you were able to resume those conversations and provide us some additional information on the finances from the school district that would be helpful.

Mr. Bender – I think it is a breakdown of fixed and variable cost in order to ascertain what the variable cost of adding that one person is. Adding those 100 students.

Mr. McDonald – And the other side of this graph on the industrial development, we've already talked a little bit about the conservative numbers that we are looking at for industrial development with 420,000 square feet being developed. I would also zone in on the 252 employees that are going to be contributing to our property taxes knowing that we have industrial properties on Foltz already that are a quarter of that size with more employees that are represented than the 252. So I also think that the benefits of industrial development should we have employees in there, could be much greater than what is represented on this slide.

Mr. Kolick – Mr. Chairman, and maybe even for Mr. Rinker, Mr. Rinker we are not going to be meeting again for two weeks so if there is anything further that you feel would be helpful to the Commission, please submit it, we are more than happy to entertain it. We won't have another forum so to speak to discuss it, the Planning Commission members will discuss it on the floor before they act on it so if there is anything like these financial questions, whatever, please get it over to the Commission.

Mr. Rinker – These are very good questions we will definitely follow up.

Mr. Kolick – If there is anything more you care to present let us know. Right now we have until February 19th from Council's last extension, unless they extend it again to act on this which means that we only have one more meeting namely on February 11th to act on it. So unless Council would give us another extension I would anticipate that the Commission will act on it on the 11th, so just keep that in mind so there is enough time to get it to the Commission members. Just like your other information was helpful, each one of the Commission member was able to obtain a copy of it.

Mr. Rinker – Very well, thank you.

Mr. Kolick – Thank you.

Mr. McDonald – Are there any other questions from the members of the Planning Commission tonight? Would the applicant like to make any additional comments about the proposal?

Mr. Rinker – I think we covered all that territory pretty well tonight, thank you.

Mr. McDonald – We appreciate you time, as we discussed earlier we will table this for this evening and we will move on to our next Agenda Item.

Mr. Kolick – Before we do that, if anybody was here just for this and they care to leave, go ahead, we have one other item unrelated to this that we need to discuss and we will give you a couple of minutes to clear out so to speak and then we will go on.

Mr. Roth – Didn't you offer anyone here to ask questions?

Mr. Kolick – We can't, no there will be a Public Hearing before City Council so please everybody that is here understand you will be able to address City Council at the Public Hearing.

Mr. Roth – There is a lot of hogwash we have to talk about here. Hogwash, unbelievable. We only get 9% of residential money.

Mr. Kolick – Okay, Mr. Roth, please for now, there will be an opportunity to speak before City Council. Wait till everybody is out and then we will cover the last thing.

Mr. Bender – Thank you very much.

REFERRALS FROM COUNCIL:

ORDINANCE NO. 2021-006

An Ordinance Amending Sections 1272.03; 1272.04; 1272.05; 1272.09; 1272.11; 1272.12 and 1272.30 of Title Six of Part Twelve of the Planning and Zoning Code of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Strongsville, Concerning Sign Requirements.

Mr. McDonald – You guys don't mind if we proceed with our Agenda do you? Alright the second Item on the Agenda, Ordinance Number 2021-006, Mr. Kolick.

Mr. Kolick – Yes, this is an Ordinance that we introduced administratively dealing with the signage Code because we've been getting a plethora of requests for variances on signage before the Board of Zoning Appeals and they seem to be acting affirmatively on that so we are looking at, when we start doing that we start looking at do we need Code. This Ordinance does three things; one, it permits drive thru menu signs, like if you are driving through a Burger King or Starbucks or whatever, believe it or not in our current Code we don't permit drive thru signs so every drive thru restaurant that came into the City we have had to send them through the Board of Zoning Appeals, so that's just not making sense because they would typically grant those variances which is the only way they can conduct business so that is added to the Code to permit drive thru menu signs and gives criteria for it, the size and what you can do with it and it has to be sound proof so to speak so that it is not hitting residential areas and these types of things. The second thing is, it brings our illumination of signs into the current standards. Right now it defines it as foot candles and it is changing it to lumens which is evidentially what the industry standard is. So that is what that does and the last thing is we were getting many many variance requests for wall signage where people wanted to put up two wall signs, still stayed within the total square footage but they wanted two signs, maybe it said pharmacy and drugs instead of one and the Code didn't permit it so every time they were coming to the BZA and granting variances to do it with the caveat that you had to stay within the total square footage. This now changes that to reflect that so at least the administrative, the Building Department, would request that you consider this favorably and move it back to City Council. Just like the other Ordinance, City Council will still have to have a Public Hearing and do all that but at least it would modernize our sign Code. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McDonald – Are there any questions? Can we bring anybody from the previous group back in to talk about this for a while so we can get to an even 3 hours?

Mr. McDonald - ORDINANCE NO. 2021-006: An Ordinance Amending Sections 1272.03; 1272.04; 1272.05; 1272.09; 1272.11; 1272.12 and 1272.30 of Title Six of Part Twelve of the Planning and Zoning Code of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Strongsville, Concerning Sign Requirements.

Mr. David – At 8:16 p.m I Move to give favorable consideration for Ordinance 2021-006.

Mr. Pfahl – Second.

Mr. McDonald – Secretary, are you still here, please call the roll.

Roll Call: All Ayes APPROVED

Mr. McDonald – To the Court Reporter who is still packing up, we appreciate your attendance. Mr. Schonhut, you have a favorable recommendation to take back to City Council.

Mr. McDonald - Any other business to come before this Commission this evening? Seeing none, we are adjourned. Good job everybody, thanks for sitting through this.

Greg McDonald, Chairman

Carol M. Brill

Carol M. Brill, Recording Secretary

Approved