

HERMITAGE PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES

Monday
October 1, 2007
Regular Meeting
8:30 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Chuck Rogers – Chairman
Woody Steele – Secretary
Ed Benton
Laura Blaire
John Coupland
Shannon McConnell
Mark Passalinqua
Chester B. Scholl
James Tamber

OTHERS PRESENT:

Jeremy Coxe
Tom Kuster
Cindy Pagliaroli
Jan Farmakis
Gary Hinkson
Joe Pinchot
Tom Nock
Luanne Franklin
Kathy Koledin

There were 2 others in attendance.

Mr. Rogers called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. in the Hermitage Municipal Building, Conference Room #303.

Mr. Rogers asked for public input. There was none.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mr. Rogers asked for approval of the minutes of the September 17, 2007 meeting. Mr. Benton made a motion to approve the September 17th minutes. Mr. Passalinqua seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously. The minutes were approved as distributed.

SUBDIVISION PLANS:

Sharon R. Hanson Revocable Trust Subdivision Lot # 1 (South Darby Road)

Mr. Coxe explained that the purpose of this plan is to convey Lot #1, a non-building lot, to the adjoining lands of the Hanson Revocable Trust to the north. He stated that the City of Hermitage is purchasing the remaining 53.614 acres of the Hanson property for a recreational facility.

Approval of the plan would have the following contingencies.

- 1) Drawing corrections
- 2) Two sets of permanent ink mylars with signatures and seals

Mr. Coxe asked for questions on this plan. There were none. Mr. Rogers asked for a motion for approval. Mr. Steele made a motion to approve the Sharon R. Hanson Revocable Trust Subdivision Lot #1 with the noted contingencies. Mrs. McConnell seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Y.M.C.A. Plan of Lots, Lot 1 (North Hermitage Road)

Mr. Coxe explained that the purpose of this plan is for the creation of a separate building lot of 1.524 acres. He noted that the Hermitage Board of Commissioners recently approved a rezoning change for this parcel from Institutional to Highway Commercial.

Approval of the plan would have the following contingencies.

- 1) Drawing corrections
- 2) Approval of DEP Planning Module
- 3) Letter from water company verifying water service or executed waterline extension agreement
- 4) Two sets of permanent ink mylars with signatures and seals

Mr. Rogers asked for additional comments. There were none. Mr. Tamber made a motion to approve the Y.M.C.A. Plan of Lots, Lot 1 Subdivision with the noted contingencies. Dr. Coupland seconded the motion. Mr. Scholl abstained. The motion carried.

LAND DEVELOPMENT PLANS:

Dr. Cheryl A. Duffy Office Land Development Plan (Innovation Way)

Mr. Coxe explained that the purpose of this plan is for the development of a 1.742-acre parcel of land and construction of a 7,200 square-foot professional office building.

Approval of the plan would have the following contingencies.

- 1) Drawing corrections, including landscaping and site improvements as per Zoning Ordinance
- 2) Approval of Stormwater Management Report by City Engineer
- 3) Two sets of permanent ink mylars with signatures and seals

Mr. Coxe asked for questions on this plan. Mrs. McConnell asked if there was a need for a connection to Lot 17. Mr. Coxe replied that he saw no access to Lot 17.

Mr. Rogers stated that the Planning Commission has been encouraging developers to screen parking and locate it to the rear of new buildings, and he noted that this plan does not follow that recommendation. Mr. Rogers commented that the developer should consider changing the placement of the parking.

Tom Nock of C. Tucker Cope & Associates pointed out that there is a bike trail to the rear by Lot 17 and he stated that there is a plan to eventually build a sidewalk to be used by the office staff that will connect with the trail. Mr. Nock also noted that two existing facilities in LindenPointe have parking in the front of the buildings.

Mr. Rogers asked for additional comments. There were none. He then asked for a motion for approval. Mr. Scholl made a motion to approve the Dr. Cheryl A. Duffy Office Land Development Plan with the noted contingencies. Mr. Benton seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

PLANNING MODULES:

Y.M.C.A. Plan of Lots, Lot 1 (North Hermitage Road)

Mr. Coxe explained that this is the standard Planning Module to accompany the subdivision plan.

Mr. Rogers asked for comments. There were none. Mr. Rogers asked for a motion for approval. Dr. Coupland made a motion to approve the Y.M.C.A. Plan of Lots, Lot 1 Planning Module. Mrs. Blaire seconded the motion. Mr. Scholl abstained. The motion carried.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Institutional-3 Zoning District – Dr. Coupland said that a committee consisting of himself and Mr. Benton met recently with Mrs. Hirschmann and Mr. Coxe, and Superintendent Karen Ionta and Attorney Roger Shaffer of the Hermitage School District to discuss the proposed Institutional-3 Zoning District. He noted that no changes were suggested to the proposed language that was presented to the Planning Commission in September.

Dr. Coupland said that the School District privately owns the access road that connects school property to North Hermitage Road and he was given the impression that the School District is not eager to share the access road with other developments. He suggested that the City meet with the School District more often to share ideas and concerns.

Mr. Coxe explained that the City staff developed the proposed Institutional-3 Zoning District at the direction of the Board of Commissioners. He said that in October the Board would introduce an ordinance for a map and text amendment to rezone to Institutional-3 the land on North Hermitage Road, between the School District access road and Highland Road. The ordinance will then come before the Planning Commission for an official recommendation.

Mr. Steele asked if the School District presented any idea as to what position they would take on this proposed rezoning. Mr. Benton replied that none was presented.

Mrs. McConnell said that she felt rezoning the land would open it up to commercial development and she asked if changing the zoning to allow a restaurant was reason enough to impact the School District.

Dr. Coupland said that he asked why the School District had not purchased the Franklin property and he was told by the representatives that the property was too expensive.

Mr. Benton noted that the School District did state that there was no master plan in effect at this time.

Kathy Koledin of McConnell Road commented that she felt the School District was making a subtle threat by stating their ownership of the access road. Dr. Coupland replied, and Mr. Benton agreed, that the meeting with the School District representatives was not at all threatening, but cooperative.

Mr. Rogers commented that the rezoning request for the Franklin property impacts not only one lot but the entire area.

Mr. Tamber asked if the School District owned and maintained the entire access road. Mr. Coxe replied that it is a private drive and the School District owns and maintains it.

Dr. Coupland stated that the committee has no recommendation at this time regarding the proposed Institutional-3 District and said that there are no future discussions scheduled.

Lighting / Buffer Requirements – Mrs. McConnell reported that she and Mr. Passalinqua, members of the committee formed to study lighting and buffer requirements, met with Mrs. Hirschmann and Mr. Coxe recently and determined that lighting should be determined on a case-by-case basis.

She noted that buffer requirements are still being discussed and will be looked at more closely during future committee meetings. Mrs. McConnell said that sample sketches were suggested for developers to follow and she mentioned the possibility of establishing three separate zones for buffer requirements.

Mr. Rogers said that he would like to attend future committee meetings.

Shenango Valley Multi-Municipal Comprehensive Plan update – Jeremy Coxe said there was no current update.

Mercer County Regional Planning Commission update – Mr. Benton reported that upcoming issues for review include Stormwater Management Programs that may contain hidden costs upon implementation and recorded opposition to the establishment of Interstate 80 as a toll road with concerns for the allocation of funds from such tolls.

There were no public comments. The meeting adjourned at 8:57 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cindy Pagliaroli
October 2, 2007