

**Zoning Commission**  
**Work Session Meeting**  
**September 6, 2012**  
**1**

Ch. Kamps called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Roll Found: Kamps, Siarkowski, Walrath, Powell, Kman and Nehrenz present. Also present were Ms. Susan Hirsch, Trustee Schulte and Trustee Catherwood.

Ch. Kamps noted that the township will cover the consultant fees of Ms. Hirsch for two more meetings, the September and October meetings. Trustee Catherwood noted that the Board agreed to appropriate an additional \$1000 of consultant fees.

The first section discussed will be Section 3 Definitions.

Ch. Kamps noted under Accessory Living Quarters that Hinckley typically only allows one dwelling unit and isn't sure that adding a second one is necessary or should be added. Mr. Walrath noted that he recalls the discussion was to remove the definition completely. After further discussion, it was agreed to remove Accessory Living Quarters completely from the regulations.

The definition of Driveway was discussed. Ch. Kamps recalled that they rewrote the definition differently than that shown. Ms. Hirsch questioned if #1 definition was acceptable. After discussion, it was suggested to make the definition "A private roadway providing access for vehicles to the property." All parties agreed on this definition.

Ch. Kamps discussed the various definition options for Home Based Business. Mr. Powell stated he liked the second definition and thought it simplified the definition best. Discussion took place. Ch. Kamps noted that he likes the original definition and thinks it best defines what a Home Based Business is. It was determined to use the original definition but add to the end "and be operated in such a way that they do not adversely affect adjacent properties." It was also noted that the beginning of the definition should read: "Any *business* use..."

Under Home Occupation it was noted the definition should read: "Any *business* use..."

Ch. Kamps discussed the various definition options for Personal Services Establishments. Ch. Kamps noted he liked option #5. Mr. Walrath questioned #5 that it lists physical things being done. Should lawyers, accounts, etc. be included on the list? Ms. Hirsch noted that is more of professional services, not personal services. Mr. Walrath noted he is ok with the original definition. Mr. Powell noted that this is just a definition and the services listed are just examples and wasn't necessary to list all services, but list some as more for examples. After further discussion, it was agreed to use definition #5.

**Zoning Commission**  
**Work Session Meeting**  
**September 6, 2012**  
**2**

Mr. Walrath noted under Pond to add the word or to make the sentence read: "...occurring naturally *or* made by...."

There were no further comments in Section 3 Definitions.

Ch. Kamps noted the next section to discuss is Section 18 Alternative Energy Systems.

Ch. Kamps questioned prior to reviewing the section if the Board was interested in having an alternative energy section and at the last discussion the consensus seemed that they were not interested in having a section on windmills. He stated that an agreement should be reached prior to reviewing the section. Ch. Kamps noted in his opinion there should be a section included. Mr. Kman asked if there are windmills currently installed in the area. Ch. Kamps to his knowledge there were no windmills installed. Ms. Hirsch noted that it is written that they are approved up to 35' in height and proposed windmills taller than 35' that a study would be required and a variance obtained. Mr. Kamps questioned how anyone in the township would really know whether the study would be valid. Mr. Powell stated that they don't have enough information to be able to make a decision or to agree to write a regulation on windmills. He suggested making them a conditional use. Further discussion took place. There was no decisive conclusion from the discussion. Ch. Kamps asked if the subject should be tabled until further research or seminars could be obtained. It was agreed to table. Ch. Kamps called for a motion to table the discussion and inclusion of all alternative energy sources. Mr. Walrath moved the motion and Mr. Powell seconded the motion.

**Vote: Kamps – yes, Siarkowski – yes, Walrath – yes, Powell – yes, Kman – yes**

Ch. Kamps noted they will skip Windmills, Woodburning Furnaces and Solar Energy sources at this time.

Ch. Kamps noted they will move on to review Section 10 Sign Regulations and review Mr. Thorne's comments.

Ms. Hirsch noted Mr. Thorne's first comment was how to define front wall under page 2, item 1000.2.C.1. Ms. Hirsch suggested to include "main entry" in the wording. All parties agreed.

Ms. Hirsch noted Mr. Thorne questioned how the size of 64SF for an off-premise sign was reached. Ch. Kamps recalls that it was a nominal sign size for an off premise sign that they decided upon in a previous worksession.

Ms. Hirsch noted that the word 'and' after 620.3 was deleted from the sentence under Section 1000.3.E.2.a)ii). There were no issues with this revision.

**Zoning Commission**  
**Work Session Meeting**  
**September 6, 2012**  
**3**

Ms. Hirsch noted that under Section 1000.3.H Mr. Thorne noted that digital signs may be used in residential districts as part of a conditional use site plan so she added in the sentence "...districts, *and in residential districts as part of the conditional use site plan for authorized nonresidential uses as permitted in Section 610.3 or 620.3.*" There were no issues with this revision.

Ms. Hirsch noted under Section 1000.3.I.2.b) Temporary Residential Sign that Mr. Thorne noted there is a lot of deference toward political signs. Ch. Kamps asked if they deleted a reference to political signs. Mr. Walrath noted it shouldn't be an issue due to their definitions of a sign and political signs are not signs by definition and aren't regulated.

Ms. Hirsch noted on page 8 under Section 1000.5.F, she added "Signs, other than *political signs and...*" Ch. Kamps noted that this eliminates the discussion of political signs since this stated they are not prohibited. Also see definition of signs as noted during the discussion of Section 1000.3.I.2.b). There were no other discussions on this revision.

Ms. Hirsch noted under Section 1000.6.B.1. she added the Medina County building code and removed "and other applicable requirements of the Township and." There were no issues with that revision.

Ms. Hirsch noted that Mr. Thorne questioned the definition of sign, specifically the part of being visible from a public right of way and what a structural design is. Ms. Hirsch questioned if there were a sign in someone's back yard, will that be allowed. The general consensus was that the sign needed to be visible and that they haven't had any issues with any signs in someone's back yard. Regarding a structural design, Mr. Walrath stated that would be something that is built in as part of the building/structure. As an example, if say McDonalds had a building with the arches built in the building as part of the brick; it would be a structural design whereas the arches in the front would not be structural. Both items were discussed further and it was decided to leave the definition as written.

It was noted that in the definition of Sign the boxed Alternative, it should read: "The term "sign" shall not include any flag, badge, *of* insignia or any governmental unit..." It was decided to move on and leave the definition of sign as written.

There were no further comments in Section 10 Signs.

Ch. Kamps noted they will review Section 11 Site Plan Review.

Ms. Hirsch noted that Mr. Thorne questioned why the Zoning Commission had to be involved with item B.3 of Section 1102. Ch. Kamps noted that they do not need to be involved and that item can be eliminated.

**Zoning Commission**  
**Work Session Meeting**  
**September 6, 2012**  
**4**

Ms. Hirsch noted Mr. Thorne questioned the purpose of Section 1103.D. It was discussed it was meant to give the applicant an idea and suggestions and also give them some direction. After further discussion it was agreed to leave as is.

Section 1104.M was revised. All parties agreed with the revision submitted.

Section 1105.K was revised. All parties agreed with the revision submitted.

Section 1109.A.1 was revised. All parties agreed with the revision submitted.

Sections 1109.B and C were revised. All parties agreed with the revision submitted.

Section 1110.B was revised. All parties agreed with the revision submitted.

There were no further comments regarding Section 11 Site Plan Review.

Ch. Kamps noted they will review Section 5 Districts and Zoning Map.

Ms. Hirsch noted that Mr. Thorne pointed out that R-1 and R-2 was originally called the same but was then revised to distinguish between the two districts. He suggested that the same be done for I-1 and I-2. Ms. Hirsch suggested calling I-1 Office/Light Industrial District and I-2 Light Manufacturing District. It was suggested to call it Light Manufacturing/Industrial District. All parties agreed with these revisions.

Ch. Kamps noted that under Section 510.3, it should be the Township Fiscal Officer, not township clerk as noted.

Ms. Hirsch questioned if 510.5.F was necessary. After discussion, it was agreed it could be removed.

There were no further comments regarding Section 5 Districts and Zoning Map.

Ch. Kamps noted they will review Section 6 District Regulations.

Ms. Hirsch noted the wording "their uses" was added to Section 610.2.D. There were no exceptions taken to that revision.

Ms. Hirsch noted the wording "on site" was removed from Section 610.2.E.1. There were no exceptions taken to that revision.

**Zoning Commission**  
**Work Session Meeting**  
**September 6, 2012**  
**5**

Mr. Walrath suggested removing the word “proposed” in Sections 610.2.E.1.d, 610.2.E.1.e and 610.2.E.1.g. All parties agreed to the revision.

Trustee Catherwood noted that per Mr. Thorne Sections 610.2.E.1.b and 610.2.E.1.f contradict. Mr. Walrath questioned if these two sections really contradict and it just states the material, goods or equipment needs to be out of sight and item b. states the occupation shall be completely within the dwelling. Ms. Hirsch noted she thinks the contradiction was in f. it stated material had to be housed in a permanent structure and b. states everything has to be within the dwelling and not in any accessory building. With the revision in f. stating “All materials, goods, or equipment indicative of the proposed use shall not be visible from the exterior of the dwelling, it clears up the conflict. After further discussion, it was agreed to make the revisions as written.

Ms. Hirsch noted that Sections 610.2.F.10&11 should be located under general regulations applicable to all residential districts. All parties agreed to that revision.

Ch. Kamps questioned what the issue was with Section 610.7.B.1.b. Ms. Hirsch stated that Mr. Thorne questioned to why that wouldn’t be included. A discussion was started but it was agreed to discuss further at the next work session.

Ms. Hirsch noted that if there are any items that need revisions or if there are questions, to email her between meetings so some of the revisions can be made more efficiently.

Ch. Kamps noted that the next meeting will be held on October 4, 2012.

Meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

**Zoning Commission**  
**Work Session Meeting**  
**September 6, 2012**  
**6**

Todd Gienger, Recording Secretary

Minutes Approved: \_\_\_\_\_, 2012

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jim Kamps, Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Karen Siarkowski, Vice Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Terry Walrath, Member

\_\_\_\_\_  
Calvin Powell, Member

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Absent)  
William Spellman, Member

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mel Kman, Alternate Member

\_\_\_\_\_  
John Nehrenz, Alternate Member