

XENIA TOWNSHIP ZONING COMMISSION
MEETING

November 27, 2018

THESE MINUTES ARE A SUMMARY OF THE EVENTS OF THE MEETING AND ARE NOT A WORD FOR WORD ACCOUNT OF THE DISCUSSIONS WHICH TOOK PLACE.

The Xenia Township Zoning Commission held a meeting on November 27, 2018 at 6:00 p.m. at the Xenia Township Trustees Office, 8 Brush Row Road, Xenia, OH, 45385; this meeting was advertised on the Xenia Township website within 24 hours of scheduling the meeting.

Jeffrey Zweber called the meeting to order at 6:15 p.m.

Attendees: Jeffrey Zweber, Chair, Kent Harbison, Virgil Ferguson, Roy Colbrunn, Alan King and Mary Haller

Mr. Zweber went over the agenda for the evening and asked about Mrs. Randall's resignation. Mrs. Haller explained Mrs. Randall resigned her seat due to her moving out of Xenia Township and that it had been excepted by the Trustees during their last meeting.

Mr. Zweber moved to approve the minutes from the September 25, 2018 meeting as presented. Mr. Colbrunn seconded the motion. All voted aye.

Mr. Zweber moved to approve the minutes from the October 16, 2018 meeting as presented. Mr. Ferguson seconded the motion. All voted aye.

Mr. Zweber stated there last discussion was about the Central Water and Sewer language in each district. He stated they also made changes to the language for the E District within the Intent and Purpose section of that section. Mr. King asked about the permit process for adding a lot to an existing district. Mr. Zweber stated this would be handled as a map change and rezoning. There was discussion how this process would be different when establishing a new plat.

Mr. Zweber read the change made to the E District for the Intent and Purpose section. There was discussion about if there should be something added to include language for a map amendment. Everyone agreed to the language of "by an amendment to the zoning resolution." Mr. Zweber stated if Regional Planning wanted to change it, he would be good with their change.

Mr. Zweber stated the next district to work on would be the RM district. He stated a person could make 5 acre lots in the A District, or take 30 acres, make an E District with ten three acre lots or 50 acres to make an R-1 District 50 half acre lots. He stated he did not think they wanted 50 acres of apartment buildings or to have apartment buildings out in the middle of a farm field. He did not think this was the philosophy they wanted to use. He stated if they have 50 acres of R-1 then they could possibly put apartments up next to it, or in the middle of it.

Mr. Zweber stated the next district to look through was the IG District and stated this may be the easiest district to work with and it could stand alone. There was discussion about the lot size for this district and what types of buildings could be built. Mr. Zweber read Section 405.5 regarding yard requirements and asked if the IG District had to be next to a Residential, B-2 or B-3 District.

Mr. King stated the yard requirements may be referring to the setbacks. Mr. Zweber stated there were yard requirements in most districts so he suggested the wording should be the IG District match the adjacent and surrounding districts. Mr. King stated he agreed with that suggestion. Mr. Zweber suggested moving through the other districts to see if there was similar language in them.

Mr. Zweber stated the picture he had in his head of the B-1 District was to not have too many of these together. He stated there could be 50 acres of R-1 and might have one or two of the B-1 lots adjacent to the R-1. There was discussion and examples of where these districts would be placed in the Township.

Mr. Zweber asked how small of a lot should a lot be for the B-2 District. Mr. Zweber stated he felt the difference between the B-2 and B-3 District was that B-3 would be a store like Walmart. He stated B-3 was for big retail. There was discussion about a district size being 50 acres and which districts should have this 50 acre minimum district size. Mr. King asked if the 50 acre minimum was to help with nuisances like light and sound. There was discussion about the lights and sounds associated with the B-3 District. There was discussion about what roads a B-3 District should be placed on due to traffic and noise. Mr. Zweber stated it would make sense to have a B-2 District next to a B-3 District as it would be putting the less offensive district closer to any residential district. Mr. Colbrunn asked if they were to allow additional lots to be added to a business district, then how close did they want to allow a business district to encroach upon a R-1 District. He stated he thought they would want to have some sort of buffer zone between those two districts. There was discussion about the minimum lot zone for the business districts. Mr. Ferguson stated the minimum lot size for the B-3 District was 5 acres. Mr. King added the lot coverage for B-3 was 20% and asked what was included in the 20%. Mr. Zweber stated he believed it was any impervious material. Mr. Zweber stated if they move on to the M-1 District, which he would consider the next more intensive use and read a few examples of businesses. Mr. Zweber asked if the major difference between B-3 and M-1 was retail and non-retail. There was discussion about the differences between the M-1 and M-2 districts. The members referred to the zoning map to locate the different districts. Mr. King stated the focus of the meeting tonight was more about lot size. Mr. Zweber agreed and added he also wanted to discuss adjacency and at some point, road frontage would come into play. Mr. Colbrunn asked if Mr. Zweber thought M-1 and M-2 should be 50 acres. Mr. Zweber stated he was struggling with the nuisance difference between M-1 and B-3. There was discussion about the types of nuisances in each of B-3 and M-1. Mr. Colbrunn asked about the types of roads these districts should be able to build on. Mr. Zweber agreed and stated it would help if the Township had a thoroughfare plan.

Mr. Zweber stated for the E and R-1 districts, there is a minimum lot size and there had to be a number of lots together to get to the district size. He stated if they model the business districts as they have the residential district then they could use similar language. He asked how small of a lot should they have for the business districts. Mr. Ferguson stated he thought at least 10 acres for a business. Mr. Colbrunn stated they were looking at two things, developing a new district and adding on to a district like they had done with the residential districts. Mr. Ferguson asked how many businesses could be put in a district. Mr. Zweber stated that would be dependent on the lot size. Mr. King stated if they were going to have water and sewer then that would also have to be used to determine the lot size. Mr. Zweber stated he would like to stay away from worrying about sewer and water and leave that to the County. He asked to add a lot to an existing district, what would be the smallest piece of land that they would want to allow to the M-1 district. Mr. Colbrunn asked how dense do they want an M-1 District to get. He stated if someone wanted to get a denser area, they could ask for a variance but thought an acre would be enough to start a business. Mr.

Harbison stated if it was close enough to the city limit, they could possibly tap into water and sewer. Mr. Zweber stated that could be a possibility. Mr. Harbison stated that would also put that problem on the health department. There was discussion that one acre would be feasible for the minimum size. They decided five acres would be the minimum lot size and the minimum road frontage would be 300 feet for the M-1.

Mr. Zweber stated the next section to work on would be the intent and purpose for the M-2 District. He suggested, "This district provides heavy industrial development for uses with significant external effects such as heavy traffic, open storage, etc." He stated he thought this was important to keep. There was discussion about the language and Mr. Zweber's suggestion. There was discussion about what district would be ideal to be adjacent to the M-2 District and the minimum size of the district. Mr. Zweber stated he would like to copy the same language for the M-1 District. There was discussion about the language for the M-1 District and everyone agreed with, "This district provides light industrial development with limited external effects such as limited traffic, storage materials, etc. The District shall be no less than five contiguous acres with a minimum lot size of one acre with the road frontage being 150 feet."

Mr. Zweber stated the last piece would be the road language. Mr. Colbrunn asked if they should do some home work with the County and see if they have some good definitions so they do not conflict with those. Mr. Zweber stated he thought that was a good idea. Mr. Zweber stated they had discussed how big of a road was needed for the M-1 District. There was discussion about the types of roads within the township and which ones would be appropriate for the business districts.

Mr. Zweber asked for any further discussion and Ms. Haller stated she had a form for everyone to sign regarding meetings attended for the 2018 year. She passed the form around to the Commissioners and thanked everyone for their service.

Mr. Zweber moved to adjourn, Mr. Colbrunn seconded the motion. All voted aye. Meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

ATTEST:

Alan D. Stock, Zoning Inspector