

XENIA TOWNSHIP ZONING COMMISSION

MEETING

August 22, 2017

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 August 22, 2017 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, Alan King, Virgil Ferguson, Kent Harbison and Alan Stock, Zoning Inspector/Administrator.

Mr. Zweber read over the agenda and asked if there were any comments regarding the minutes from the last meeting. Mr. Zweber moved to approve the minutes from the July 25, 2017 meeting with one correction. All voted aye.

Mr. Zweber asked for discussion about next week's joint meeting. Mr. Stock advised that during the public hearing the attorney pointed out there were a few things that were not included in the definitions of the Zoning Resolution. He asked if the Commission was still planning to send each section of the Land Use Plan to the Trustees as they were completed. Mr. Zweber stated that he would like to discuss Planned Unit Developments and the Land Use Plan. Mr. Zweber stated that he would like to discuss what the Trustees think would be appropriate in Rural Businesses, because some of the business districts are not clear about city services. There was discussion about water and sewer services for business districts. Mr. King asked if these topics should be prioritized in any way or how they should be addressed. Mr. Zweber stated that he would like to prioritize them. He stated that he thought the Land Use Plan should be number one.

Mr. King asked about the topic of election signs and if this would be coming up before November. Mr. Stock advised that it was and that it was on the Township website and a letter sent to the Greene County Board of Elections explaining where signs will be taken if they are not placed properly. There was discussion about political signs in the Township.

Mr. Stock advised that the working copy had no changes from the last meeting and he asked if there needed to be any. Mr. Zweber explained that they talked about the organization of the plan and Chapter One but had not made any changes. Mr. King explained what was discussed regarding Chapter one in the last meeting. Mr. Zweber agreed and advised to the other changes he was thinking about for Chapter One. Mr. Stock asked about the maps and Mr. Zweber stated that the maps will go in Chapter Two or Three.

Mr. Zweber stated that he wanted to discuss Section 1.3 regarding "Why Plan." Mr. King stated that he would like to work on the redundancies within the plan. Mr. King stated everything in the

value statement could be put under the Why Plan heading. Mr. King asked where Mr. Zweber the bullet points on the Value Statement are covered under Why Plan. Mr. Zweber stated that he wants to get rid of the Section Why Plan because it was covered by the Value Statement. There was discussion about how the bullet points, in Why Plan, are already covered by the value statement.

Mr. Zweber stated that protecting the quality of life was in the first sentence of the Value Statement. He suggested there be a sentence about schools included in the value statement. He suggested that after community activities there should be something about educational needs and services mentioned. Mr. King suggested using diversity of housing and education opportunities and activities. Mr. Zweber thought that statement would work. Mr. King asked if they should use public services or just services. Mr. Zweber thought just services would work. Mr. Zweber advised that this would cover part but then there were flood plains and steep slopes, so he was trying to find something in the value statement about these. Mr. Stock advised that the Flood Plain Overlay would take care of this. Mr. Harbison advised in the third paragraph the words “in gaining environmental quality” could cover this. Mr. Zweber stated that was what he was looking for and figured it was already there.

Mr. Zweber advised the next part of the value statement was about community vision and achieving goals. There was discussion about the vision and goals for the plan. Mr. Zweber stated that he would like to create a proposed future land use vision plan associated map. There was discussion about the wording regarding the shared vision and future land use map.

Mr. Zweber stated that there were two proposed changes to the Why Plan section and advised that this would be the time to change topics if everyone wanted to do so and discuss fences. It was decided to press on with the Land Use Plan.

Mr. Zweber advised the next point was to encourage continued economic development. Mr. King advised there was a sub-bullet there about the urban service boundary. He asked if anyone was thinking about changing any of the urban service boundary. Mr. Zweber stated that he thought they did not want to change the Urban Service Boundary outside the Special Planning areas, but might want to change them inside these areas. He stated that after they change it, they still want growth inside the Urban Service Boundary. He stated that he was happy with where the Urban Service Boundary was established right now. Mr. Zweber advised when it comes to the Value Statement, the Urban Service Boundary was about right and they would want to in fill development inside the current boundary. Mr. King asked if the boundary was the City limits or not. Mr. Zweber stated that it was not and that it was not as well defined on the map as he would like.

Mr. Zweber asked about the bullet point about education and wanted to know if they should add business to that one. Mr. Stock asked if they were suggesting diversity of economic educational and housing opportunities. Mr. Zweber stated that might work and everyone agreed that worked very well. There was discussion about the wording and where it needs to go in the value statement.

Mr. Zweber advised they would switch topics for the remainder of the meeting and discuss fences and screening. Mr. King stated that he thought originally there were no fences so that it would not block a view of houses. Mr. Stock asked whether that was for aesthetics or line of sight issues. Mr. King stated he thought it was for both reasons, because they would allow a two-foot fence, but he felt that was like telling people not to bother building a fence. There was discussion about fences and corner lots and what the original intent was in the text. Mr. King asked if there were any laws

about fences between properties and who maintained them. Mr. Stock explained there were only three fences in the Township where it was still on record that the fence was the boundary between two properties and then the maintenance was split 50/50. He advised otherwise it would have to be in a deed.

Mr. Ferguson asked what the difference between the height of fences and screening. He stated that one can be 5'6" and the other can be 6'. Mr. Zweber stated that he was not sure why they were different. There was discussion about the differences between the two.

Mr. Stock asked if anyone could think of a place where there was an alley or shared driveway, but no one could think of any. Mr. Stock stated that there were some shared driveways and was not sure if that would matter. He stated that he knew of one but it was considered a private street. Mr. Zweber stated that he thought there would need to be language reading safety and visibility to cover the exceptions. Mr. Zweber stated that they covered height when they dealt with signs and towers. Mr. Zweber asked about the screening language and what everyone thought about it. Mr. Stock advised that some of the wording came from Ohio DNR. Mr. Zweber agreed and suggested that when they write anything they may want to mention over mining or see mining. Mr. Stock advised that Section 515 the last sentence mentions an enforcement officer, which the Township does not have, and he had never brought any screening issues to the Commission as the Zoning Inspector. Mr. Stock asked if this was something the Commission would like to keep or put this under the Inspector. Mr. Zweber stated that he is happy putting it under the Inspector. There was discussion about two screenings that Mr. Stock has worked on recently. Mr. King stated that he did not think there needed to be any major changes under the screening resolution.

Mr. Zweber stated that he believes this came up for discussion because of issues along US 68 South, a business has a newly constructed front yard fence which was non-conforming. Mr. Stock advised that this was a structure because it was attached to the ground. Mr. Stock stated that this business conformed to the setback in B-3 which was 25 feet. Mr. Zweber asked for clarification about the thing that looks like a fence, that is containing landscaping materials, was a structure. Mr. Stock advised that this was a structure because it was permanently attached to the ground. There was discussion about the definition of a front yard and buildings on a B-3 parcel. Mr. Zweber stated that he thinks first they would need to find the principle use of the lot, then decide which building was the main building if the lot has multiple buildings. Mr. Zweber stated that they may want to consider more screening to deal with aesthetics for the other zoning districts as well.

Mr. Ferguson moved to adjourn, Mr. Zweber seconded the motion. All voted aye. Meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

ATTEST:

Alan D. Stock Zoning Inspector