

KINGSTON TOWNSHIP ZONING COMMISSION

PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES

April 18, 2007 – Kingston Township Hall

APPROVED: MAY 16, 2007

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE KINGSTON TOWNSHIP ZONING RESOLUTION,
ARTICLE VIII, PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT AND ARTICLE IV,
DEFINITIONS**

PRESENT: Chairperson Jeanna Burrell, Dewey Akers, Jim Grove, Craig Cope, Doug Harsany, Alternate Maribeth Deavers, Zoning Inspector Bob Talbott, Zoning Secretary Dave Stites, Court Reporter Kathy Cathell, Zoning Attorney Michael O'Reilly, and nine township residents of the attended the meeting—see attached Sign In Sheet.

INTRODUCTION:

Chairperson Burrell called the meeting to order at 7 p.m., welcomed those in attendance, introduced the members of the Zoning Commission, and provided a brief explanation of the process used to create the proposed amendment to the zoning resolution.

PRESENTATION:

Mr. Tom Bowlus, Poggemeyer Design Group, Bowling Green, Ohio provided a review of proposed changes to Article VIII, Planned Residential Development (PRD). The review covered Sections 8.01 through 8.08 using bulleted points found on attached Exhibit A. Within Section 8.03, Consultant Bowlus recommended that paragraphs 8.03 (B) and (D) be removed from the PRD update prior to presentation to the Trustees.

A significant portion of the discussion focused upon the proposed density formula for PRD development vs. the use of a developer funded Farm Residential Developments (FR-1) yield plan. Consultant Bowlus pointed out that the density formula has been adapted as a standard by many other government entities, provides estimates with close comparison to yield studies, and is highly recommended by statewide and national conservation design experts.

He reiterated that proposed changes stay consistent with the existing code in that Planned Residential Developments (PRD) have the same density of FR-1, i.e. density neutral. He emphasized that the quality of open space and preservation of natural resources were important factors reflected in the proposed changes. Township residents have advised the Zoning Commission that they do not want the township's development to look like municipal development. The residents have said that ¼ acre lots are too urban and they prefer ½-1 acre clustering. When built out in FR-1, residents will miss the viewsheds so setbacks, especially matching adjoining setbacks, are important.

Consultant Bowlus also emphasized proposed changes to Section 8.07 Review Procedures. He explained that developers look at the bottom line development costs, and that the proposed language gives a developer a chance to communicate with the township up front, become familiar with the zoning requirements and then make a decision concerning the feasibility to make a profit. He indicated that infrastructure such as streets, sidewalks, sanitary sewer, and storm sewer cost \$250/ft. to build, and lots in planned developments with 40% or more open space sell for more than conventional lots. Based on his experience in other locations of the state, he has found that planned residential developments are attractive to developers due to infrastructure cost savings. He also felt that one developer currently working within the township is representative of other developers that may be attracted to the township in the future, and the PRD also gives the township local subdivision control versus FR-1 subdivisions which are approved at the county level.

KZC Public Hearing 04-18-07

A detailed account of the presentation can be found in attached Exhibit B.

PUBLIC INPUT/COMMENT:

Several members of the audience testified at the hearing.

Mr. Wendell Taylor addressed several questions to Consultant Bowlus regarding the density formula. He felt that the formula was not attractive to developers which would steer them to FR-1 development, and lead to the destruction of existing natural resources and loss of open space. He also felt that requiring ½ acre lots vs. 1/3 acre lots would result in the same losses, increase the number of roads and make the home construction portion of the land larger. Consultant Bowlus reiterated the accuracy of the formula, the predictable cost savings to a developer by using the PRD code and the basis of the proposed changes remaining consistent with the goals of the township land use plan to maintain open space and protect natural/cultural resources.

Mr. Joe Cotter stated that he held a meeting at his residence attended by 60 people; all of whom except one supported the PRD proposed as the Pastures of Blue Church by Robert Weiler as opposed to him developing the site under FR-1 code requirements. Chairperson Burrell responded by reiterating that all work on the proposed changes to the PRD section were consistent with the zoning code enacted by the residents of the township in 2001 i.e. maintaining the rural/agricultural character, maintaining open space and protecting existing natural/cultural resources.

Mr. Robin Morgan stated that it all boils down to Weiler's threat to develop the site as FR-1—no one wants that. Ms. Tracy Trout thanked the Commission for their hard work and indicated her support for the proposed code changes. Ms. Jeanne Cruninger (spell) expressed her desire to preserve the rural culture of the township.

A detailed account of the dialog can be found in attached Exhibit B.

MOTION:

Upon concluding public testimony, a motion to continue the hearing until May 4, 2007 so the Commission could review comments from the Delaware County Regional Planning Commission before voting on the proposed amendment was made by Mr. Cope, seconded by Mr. Akers and approved unanimously. The hearing was then recessed at 9:11 p.m.

SUMBITTED BY:

Dave Stites, Zoning Secretary 04-20-07