

Long range planning meeting 8/6/18 (Draft minutes prepared by Chris Weigand during meeting)

Meeting Started: 7:05

Meeting Ended: 9:05 all in favor

In attendance

Kevin Royer

Chris Weigand

Karen Walters

Rita McMahon (consultant)

Not present

Doug Mayer

Greg Canda

Everyone present acknowledged they received document from Rita – Land Use and Housing Section changes via email, print copies available at meeting

Rita McMahon gives overview of her updates to Land Use and Housing sections

Land Use Update

1. 2003 – to present – everything is the same except Bender / Conger farm split into 8 lots since 2003 – land use document
2. drainage – riparian setbacks – to protect embankment, reduce pollution and flooding
 - a. difficult to enforce on existing structures
 - b. do you want to create a riparian program – consider this during zoning phase
3. flood hazard areas have changed – updated in 2009 and 2016 by FEMA
 - a. updated and added map to LRP doc
 - b. some areas removed
 - c. Rita provides background on flood insurance experiences
 - d. 13-21 flood control chapter / village regulation that was adopted (references 2009 maps – suggest updated this to new map)
4. wetlands – new developments should comply to wetland state and federal regulations
5. soil section – nothing has change
 - a. Rita McMahon recommends we need a steep slope regulation

Housing Update

1. All graphs and charts were updated by Rita
2. Higher rate of owner occupancy – has increased since last census (80/20 owner rental split is ideal)
3. Housing is getting older (a lot is in downtown area, historic and on smaller lot)
4. House Values (not lot values) are going up, downtown home values are about ½ value of newer housing stock - \$75 per sq. ft. / \$150 per sq. ft.
5. Housing sizes are somewhat larger than county and state – by number of rooms currently but that may change in the future censuses

6. Village population should remain flat over next 10 years (the next planning period)
7. Look at ways to support older population 65+ allowing them to stay, not attracting enough younger demographic to replace them
 - a. E.g. renovation assistance
 - b. Work with county community development program for first time buyers, social service programs – renovations that allow people to stay in their homes
 - c. Work with realtors to raise awareness
 - d. Raise awareness of county programs that help seniors and first time buyers – community development website
8. Multi-Family housing discussion – very few multi-family of 5 or more units – significantly lower than county and state
 - a. Not every community has to provide every type of use – for example we don't have to provide multi-family units – can prove it's not congruent with community
 - b. Can infill vacant lots with smaller homes, first time buyer programs, create diversity beyond just creating multi-use solutions
 - c. Need water and sewer to get larger multi-use
 - d. Sewers alone could provide some in fill new development of single family homes
 - e. How do we manage multi-unit dwellings
 - i. Aesthetic decisions? Design guidelines for new construction that reflect the history and character of the village
 - ii. Unit size in square footage
 - iii. Unit size in number of units
 - iv. "granny flat" / "efficiency" has elements necessary to live separately from main house on lot – can turn into a rental once relative exits
 - f. Multi-use district – can limit percentage of residence vs. commercial
 - i. Have community discussion around this (multi-family) – future public meeting – Rita to get this at a high level to us
 - ii. Ultimately have a vote most likely – TBD
 - g. Multifamily, affordable, and variety of types of housing are interconnected
9. High quality design
 - a. Can require certain materials e.g. finish around foundation instead of poured concrete
 - b. Currently don't require single family homes to have site plan reviews – Rita suggests we revisit this – appropriate to review – tailored to single family, not as extensive as commercial review – can tie into historic review for historic district**
 - c. Create review process for residential design
10. Historic District
 - a. Can have a separate code for Historic District – design and maintenance standards
 - b. Local historic district is an option – currently have a state district

- c. Local review board for historic district – could be planning commission (this is often the case)
- d.

Housing Policy Adjustments (see draft doc from Rita “LRP Update 2”)

Added:

- (a) Encourage reinvestment in existing housing stock through home improvement and first time home buyer programs.
- (b) Evaluate the modification of current zoning requirements for housing to encourage more affordable housing options.

-Will cover Economy, Land Ownership, Circulation on September 4 meeting (pp33-61)

-Rita McMahon met with John Stiegle on Thursday 8-2-18 to discuss Village finances e.g. JEDD now exists

Citizen Participation:

Dee Holody (In attendance)

Amy Frank-Hensley

- volunteering to help, community communication, inclusion of community
- impact of sewers from the LRP / Planning Commission –
- remind people of statement of purpose for LRP

Steve Craig

- Planning commission can adopt Long Range Plan, may not need council approval
- Reference Ohio Revised Code – review what PC can and can't do

Kathy Bertsch

- Discussion on procedure for Rita and Planning – How will planning approve this document – why aren't we voting on specific sections? We will revise entire document then review, revise, have public input, revise and approve one time

Jodi Padrutt

- Website, color coding better

Chris Weigand – provided recap of what LRP group did when it was a sub-committee. It was suggested to him that maybe print the LRP open house results and other docs and have them put in library