

**SUGARCREEK TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF ZONING COMMISSION
Tuesday, June 6th, 2023**

This regular meeting of the Sugarcreek Township Board of Zoning Commission was held on Tuesday, June 6th, 2023.

Upon call of the roll, the vote resulted in the following:

Mr. Betzs - Absent
Mr. Baldino - Absent
Mr. Schleich - Here
Ms. Moore - Here
Mrs. Hellmann - Here
Dr. Mathews - Here

Everyone in attendance stood for the pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. Moore made a motion to open 2 cases tonight, BZC1-2023 and BZC2-2023.
Dr. Mathews motioned the opening of both cases. Mr. Schleich seconded. Upon the call of the roll, the vote resulted in the following:

Mr. Schleich - Yes
Ms. Moore - Yes
Dr. Mathews - Yes

Mrs. Tilford provided the Staff Report for the cases that were initiated at last month's meeting.

Mrs. Tilford stated text was updated pursuant to the Zoning Commission's input at the meeting prior due to minor changes to the wording, particularly in the long-range land use plan.

Mrs. Tilford stated the text amendment was sent over to the Greene County Regional Planning and Coordinating, where they recommended the text amendment be approved.

Mrs. Tilford stated, we are now here to consider said zoning resolution text amendment for a recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

Mrs. Tilford clarified this amendment is to allow a PUDR development to be considered when land is not adjacent to municipality or public land adjacent to municipality.

This amendment does not mean that any specific plan we see is going to be a plan we feel we can support, this helps lay the foundation for another option. If the plan is what we want to see developed in the township, then we will want to have the ability to approve it.

Ms. Moore asked if anyone in attendance had any comments on the Staff Reports

Ms. Moore stated she had a couple of suggestions on cleaning up the wording on item F and page 82.

Appropriate buffer and quality level, do we define appropriate, or it means we consider anytime we have a case before.

Mrs. Tilford stated anytime we consider subdivision development lots that are smaller than those in an existing subdivision that abuts, we can reduce that lot size but, on a case-by-case basis. We will have to take into consideration what buffer is being proposed, and what the quality level of the development is to determine whether that the reduction in lot size is warranted. PUDs are a bit subjective, flexible, and versatile. Ultimately, the Regional Planning and Coordinating Commission was comfortable with not recommending any modifications.

Mrs. Hellmann asked once the decision is made on the first one, does that set precedent?

Mrs. Tilford stated we do not set precedent; Each case is taken on its own merit.

Dr. Mathews asked where did you get 80%?

Mrs. Tilford answered, we internally addressed the existing farms that would be considered for development and how they are adjacent to most residential developments. Having a 37,000 Sq Ft lot, would we really want a 13,000 Sq Ft lot next to it? The percentage would ensure that the transition is more natural and not as drastic. There are a lot of discussions internally with the staff but ultimately 80% was the percentage to maintain that consistency.

Mr. Schatzberg addressed the staff comments on conservation development, "what exactly is a conservation development?"

Mrs. Tilford explained the Conservation declaration District. Noting it has not been utilized yet.

Ms. Moore asked if there was anything else pertaining to the case of BZC01-2023.

Ms. Moore made a motion to approve BZ01-2023 with noted edits.

Mrs. Hellmann made a motion to approve BZ01-2023 with the changes we discussed.

Dr. Mathews seconded. Upon call of the roll, the vote resulted in the following:

Mrs. Hellmann -Yes

Mr. Schleich - Yes

Dr. Mathews - Yes

Ms. Moore -Yes

Ms. Moore asked if anyone in attendance had any comments on the second case.

Mrs. Hellmann makes a motion to approve BZ02-2023 with the changes we discussed.

Dr. Mathews seconded. Upon call of the roll, the vote resulted in the following:

Mrs. Hellmann - Yes

Dr. Mathews - Yes

Mr. Schleich - Yes

Ms. Moore -Yes

Ms. Moore stated the first Juneteenth event, Sugarcreek Cares is collaborating with Ernie Havens on Friday June 16th, from 6-7:30pm.

Ms. Moore asked if there was any Old Business.

Mrs. Tilford stated she anticipates that we will get submission under this new PUDR expanded eligibility.

Mrs. Hellmann stated the issue with Waterford landscaping.

Mrs. Hellmann addressed her concern about the struggle with the landscaping and wonders if we are being excessive with the tree quantity and layout. She asked when choosing the trees to consider the long- term effects and the repercussions once the trees are matured and need to be treated.

Mrs. Tilford stated we can certainly add that consideration to our PUD plan discussions to one.

Ms. Moore discussed proposed changes of the way to obtain a constitutional amendment in the State of Ohio.

Mrs. Hellmann asked if Costco could have a sign saying there is an additional entrance instead of backing up Feedwire.

Mrs. Tilford noted there will be a public meeting on July 13th at Sinclair in Centerville discussing options about the interchange of Wilmington Pike and 675. As part of the project, they will look at local street networks.

Ms. Moore asked if anyone else has any further concerns or issues to add.

Ms. Moore made a motion to adjourn, which was seconded by Dr. Mathews. All were in favor.