



MEDINA COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF MEETING
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 8, 2015, 6:30 P.M.
PROFESSIONAL BUILDING, LOWER LEVEL CONFERENCE ROOM

Attendees / Representing (from sign-in sheet):

Jeff Smith, developer
Jeff Holland, attorney
Andy Conrad, Medina County Highway Engineers

MCPC Members and Alternates in Attendance:

MCPC Members:

Jeff Brandon
Paul Jeffers
Ray Jarrett
Val Jesionek
Mark Kolesar
Sally Albrecht
Pat McNamara

MCPC Alternates:

Lynda Bowers, President, (for Pat Geissman)
Jason Stevenson, (for Steve Hambley)

MCDPS Staff:

Cheryl Heinly, Admin Assistant
Susan Hirsch, Associate Planner
Rob Henwood, Planning Director

Planning Director Robert Henwood called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and began with opening the floor for nominations to the Election of Officers.

I. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Mr. Henwood opened the floor for nominations. *Mr. Jarrett nominated Ms. Bowers for President, Ms. Jesionek for Vice President and Mr. Jarrett for Second Vice President.* There were no objections, all the nominations for the appointed positions were accepted, and there were no other nominations. *Mr. Brandon seconded the motion. All voted AYE and the motion passed.*

Mr. Henwood closed the floor to nominations and Ms. Bowers took over the meeting.

II. ROLL CALL

Ms. Bowers, Mr. Brandon, Ms. Albrecht, Mr. Jarrett, Mr. Kolesar, Mr. Jeffers, Mr. McNamara, Ms. Kusnerak, and Ms. Jesionak were all present at the time roll was called.

III. MINUTES

Ms. Bowers asked if there were any questions or comments regarding the December 3, 2014 minutes. There was none.

Mr. Kolesar moved to approve the December 3, 2014 minutes as presented. Mr. McNamara seconded the motion. All voted AYE and the motion was approved.

IV. CORRESPONDENCE

There was no Correspondence

V. CONSENT CALENDAR

There were no items on the Consent Calendar.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

There was no Old Business.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Retreat at Brenelle, Ph II, 105-2014 R, Replat, Granger Township

Mr. Henwood presented the staff report to the Commission regarding the above captioned subdivision located on the eastern side of Dunsha Road north of the intersection with Medina Road (SR 18).

The applicant proposes the following changes to Phase II of the Retreat at Brenelle:

- Terminate Brenelle Lane and rescind the reservation strip.
- Convert the cul-de-sac from temporary to permanent. This will decrease the lot area of Sublots 11 and 12 to accommodate the permanent cul-de-sac right-of-way (ROW).
- Add a small triangular area from the adjoining property to the east to Sublot 11 to ensure that the minimum lot size of 2 acres is maintained.

A small area of ROW will be added to the area of Phase II from the adjoining property to the east to complete the circular shape of the cul-de-sac ROW at the terminus of Brenelle Lane.

While the Replat will only address the changes to the existing subdivision the ultimate intent of the Replat is to allow access to the adjoining property to the east and to create, a metes and bounds lot (the proposed Smith split) at the terminus to Brenelle Lane

The original Preliminary Plan was approved in July of 1999; the subdivision was planned as a single phase. The Preliminary Plan was revised in April of 2004 to include Phase 2. The Final Plat for the first phase was approved in June of 2001 and in June of 2005 for the second phase.

The property immediately adjacent to the Pinnacle Sports property and the future Smith lot are zoned R-1 Residential and are also located in an area designated for PDD Planned Development District overlay (see GIS map and Zoning District detail above).¹ The PDD closest to the subject site has frontage on SR 18 with a depth of approximately 2,290 feet and covers the area from the eastern property boundary of the Pinnacle Sports property to Medina Line Road. The western PDD also has frontage on SR 18, has a depth of approximately 2,360, and covers the area between Ridge

¹ Overlay zoning is a regulatory tool that creates a special zoning district, placed over an existing base zoning district(s), which identifies special provisions in addition to or in place of those in the underlying base zone. The overlay district can share common boundaries with the base zone or cut across base zone boundaries. Regulations or incentives are attached to the overlay district to protect a specific resource or guide development within a specific area.

Road and approximately 1,500 feet from Boneta Road. The purpose statement for the PDD indicates the district is intended to encourage the development of campus style commercial, office, and industrial areas located within one of the PDD areas. Property owners must request that PDD regulations be applied to specific property in a PDD area, which is at least 50 acres and must be served by central sewer and water. Until the PDD regulations are requested, the underlying zoning remains applicable.

§ 203(g) states, “[n]o commercial or industrial access may be maintained across R-1 or R-2 zoning.”

Discussion:

Jeff Holland, attorney, represents the Smiths and the Stallards, who are the landowners. He said the community is developing and developing is a great thing but without any preservation, it is not a good thing. He did hear what Mr. Henwood said and felt he gave a fair assessment. Mr. Holland said he did hear that Mr. Henwood said to disapprove the proposal, but Mr. Holland suggested that sounded like a “soft” suggestion. He said connectivity of Brenelle Lane is not very likely or needed to develop the surrounding properties. He said this property warrants conservation that is supported by the Subdivision Regulations.

Mr. Holland said instead of asking if the road can be extended because we can see it can be extended, but should it be extended. He said there are unique issues to this property and value to the natural resources. He said Brenelle Lane is within the Sub Regulations on the length of the cul-de-sac so that would not be prohibited. He said the fire chief did not comment specifically about Brenelle Lane and only commented regarding connectivity.

Jeff Smith, applicant, said this can connect to the north. He said he had discussed this with Andy Conrad from the County Engineer’s office and he told Mr. Smith that the minimum radius had to be 300’. Mr. Smith calculated with 300’ that you would end up with less than four acres. In order to maximize the buildable lots with 320’ radius two lots would be inside. He said the orange lines were “thrown out there” to give an idea of where the lots would come into play, (Mr. Smith pointing to map explaining lines, etc.). He summarized saying with the 10 acres you would get roughly four lots.

Mr. Smith said there is a viable gas well on the property as well as a 2” gas line that runs for 3,000 feet down to SR 18. He said the question you have to ask yourself is it worth putting the infrastructure in for the four lots.

Mr. Smith said regarding extending Brenelle Lane to the north; you have to add the current road length, which is 1732 feet, and 829 feet would be 2552 feet. He noted that in the Sub Regulations that length exceeds the requirements as written. He said technically you are not violating that but you would have to ask what is the intention. Mr. Smith asked if it would be best served to extend Brenelle Lane to the north without some plan for connectivity at some point because there would be no guarantee of connectivity.

Mr. Smith speculated if a developer came in and wanted to develop the land to the north would they be thinking of the 10-acre piece to connect to Brenelle Lane. That developer would still have to put in 820-feet of road to meet with Brenelle Lane. Mr. Smith did not feel a developer would want to do that.

Mr. Holland stated that Medina County is the headwaters for many of the rivers. He said these kinds of wetland soils are like a sponge, hold water so there is not so much runoff, and down the creek flooding. He said the more we develop the landscape and neglect the wetland areas, the more likely there are more costs that come into effect.

Mr. Holland said this is just one family trying to put up a home and not a wealthy family able to do a full-fledged assessment not knowing whether it would be granted or not.

Mr. Holland said he hears all the time that people want to conserve their land so he says, put a permanent conservation easement on it. Conservation easements are forever.

Ms. Bowers said she wanted to give some of the board members and opportunity to ask some questions.

Mr. Stevenson asked if anyone from the Township was sitting in the audience. Ms. Bowers said no.

Mr. Kolesar said he had some questions but he would wait until they were done presenting.

Mr. Holland said it was his understanding that if they could show that the conservation easement was strong enough and that they could understand it, they [township] would approve it. He feels that the Township would not approve terminating the road because it would set a precedence and would be difficult to argue otherwise in the future.

Ms. Bowers asked if there is a count of temporary or permanent cul-de-sacs in the Township at this time. Nobody had that number.

Mr. Holland went on to say that the conservation easement will be held by the West Creek land conservancy, which is a 501c3 tax-exempt organization. He said its only purpose is to preserve natural land and it specializes in smaller parcels.

Mr. Holland said some of the terms of the easement will be no more building structures, no roads, no use of motorized vehicles, and no activity whatsoever detrimental to the natural conditions of the parcel. He said a copy of the easement has been given to the Township and he felt it is completely solid. He said the owner would not be able to do anything except run the envelope they keep, which is why it is not 10 acres; it is 8.08. The owners will be keeping 2.00 acres that they can do their personal things, such as mow the lawn. The rest of the parcel will have to remain natural.

Mr. Holland said if the conservation easement is violated that person will be sued by the organization and they can be forced to stop the activities and repair the land.

Mr. Smith stated that West Creek must approve where he wants to place his home and what those exempted areas are. He said West Creek is the watchdog for those sensitive areas that need to be avoided. Mr. Holland agreed with Mr. Smith that West Creek must approve the location.

Mr. Kolesar questioned what would happen if the conservancy and the landowner “but heads” and cannot come up with a resolution. Mr. Smith said it is 10.5 acres...went to map on slide to show how he felt there was plenty of room to choose where a home could go. Mr. Holland answered that they cannot move or dig in the soil until they get approval from West Creek. He said if they “but heads,” then the Smith’s lose. Because West Creek owns the easement, they have the right to enforce the easement. One of those rights is to give them carte blanche to say yes or no to the placement of the house.

Mr. Henwood asked why the applicant would agree to a conservation easement that could potentially preclude their house placement until they know they can place the house. It would not make sense for the property owner to sign on to a conservation easement that could potentially eliminate their opportunity to place a house. Ms. Bowers said they have the opportunity to condition any approval on the conservation easement. She said no conservation easement, no termination.

Mr. Henwood said he was not very impressed with the conservation easement in terms with its ability to preserve things. Mr. Kolesar asked if he was saying that for this case or in general. Mr.

Henwood said in this particular instance he was not convinced that the conservation easement is the “magic bullet” that makes this not connecting the street reasonable. He said that not only could a house go there, he would argue that a road could go there just as easily. He still has not been convinced that the road cannot go through and that it cannot do so without disturbing the environmental resources, which have been documented.

Ms. Bowers asked what would the likelihood of the road going through. Mr. Henwood answered that he did not know but his point was that the Township has expressed interest in connectivity. They have held this policy for a long time. There are street stubs to the north, but it is not necessary that it connects, but at the same time that does not mean there are not benefits to connect.

Mr. Henwood stated in his mind that the role of the Planning Commission is to look and see that all the criteria are met or not, and do they make a compelling argument as to whether the road would cause damage. He said he has not seen anything that says that is the case. Visible is a location of the wetlands and the street, so why could the street not avoid the wetlands.

Mr. Jarrett asked what would happen if the West Creek Conservancy went “defunct.” Mr. Holland answered that the West Creek Conservancy have an obligation to take any easements they hold and to put them in other organizations, which would also have the ability to hold conservation easements. He said the individuals on the board would be on the hook. The only way they could divest themselves is to transfer those conservation easement interests to another organization. Mr. Holland said the Land Trust alliance is an organization that deals land trusts all over the United States. He said the Land Trust runs into these issues all the time and that is why they have specific language included in the bylaws for these organizations.

Ms. Jesionek stated her biggest concern, even if they proposed to extend the street, and go further on the parcel to the north, she saw a lot of streams and was not sure it would be able to connect. She thought even the property to the north should have some conservation on it. She was not in favor of row lots and said it was not a good way of developing on that property in her estimation. She said that if the land to the north did not have all those streams and wetlands she would be more favorable to extending the road.

Mr. Stevenson noted that nobody attended from the Township and after reading their statement; several times he was trying to find reasoning behind their wishes to keeping it open to connectivity other than that was the policy. He asked if there was more context to that. Mr. Henwood said they had the letter in front of them. Mr. Holland said he was at the meeting and he considers Rich Pace a friend of his. He thought in this case and what they said was if they ever allow a road to terminate it takes away their argument later on. They think they would be setting some kind of precedence and people would say, ‘you did it for the Smith’s why don’t you do it for me.’ Mr. Holland said his response to that would be because this land is unique and maybe it is okay on another piece of land.

Mr. Holland asked Mr. Henwood if he thought conservation easements were not enforceable. Mr. Henwood said no, that was not his point. He said the information that has been given shows a stream and a wetland in the northeast corner of what would be the proposed Smith lot. That is the information that we have in front of us. He said we have the Balanced Growth plan which shows there are streams and there are areas of land that potentially are worthy of conservation. The Balanced Growth plan is that, it is a guide; it provides red flags for us if a development plan for that farm were to come up that would be one of the first things that staff would point out. He said one of the things that have to be addressed and worked around is the areas in the Balanced Growth Plan. Mr. Henwood said that would have to be verified by something similar and more detailed such as paperwork from the Army Corp.

Mr. Henwood went on to say the information that has been given shows that there is a stream and a wetland. He has yet to hear an argument about why that street cannot connect. He said he

understood the reservations moving forward because the property to the north is a large piece of property with a lot of opportunity for wiggle room. Mr. Smith said they are conceding that. He said the road to the north could go in.

Mr. Brandon asked if the Smiths still own the whole 10 ½ acres, even with the conservation easement. Mr. Holland said yes. Mr. Brandon asked if they sell down the road the 10 ½ acres with the easement sells together. Mr. Holland said yes. Mr. Brandon clarified that he would not be creating another parcel with the conservation easement. Mr. Smith said that was correct, part of restrictions of the conservation easement is that it cannot be subdivided.

Mr. Jarrett asked who comes out to do inspections to make sure the easements are not disrupted. Mr. Holland said it is done on a yearly basis by most land trusts but he thought West Creek does it monthly.

Andy Conrad, Highway Engineers office, stated he talked to the applicant regarding minimum radius. He said you can very easily get away from the area of concern by putting in an eyebrow cul-de-sac and making it a right turn so that would give you significant separation from the easement, stream, and wetlands. He said there are other ways to develop the property. Ms. Bowers said it is still 10 acres. Mr. Conrad said he is not disputing that, but the concern was raised about the road being close to the stream and there are other ways to develop and prepare for separation. Ms. Albrecht said it sounded like the road could still be put in and be a permanent cul-de-sac. Mr. Conrad said it would be half a cul-de-sac without a full-stop condition.

Mr. Henwood reminded the Planning Commission that the Subdivision Regulations require street connections unless one can show the criteria listed in the Subdivision Regulations is something prohibitive or there is something that says it cannot be done. Ms. Bowers said Mr. Henwood might disagree with this but she said the only realistic way this can go in is to the north from a practical standpoint. Stubs will be coming in from the north and the one coming from Brenelle Lane, which will mean three permanent temporary stubs. She said financially there is no sense to be made of what would have to happen to cross all the sensitive areas.

Ms. Bowers stated if the board does agree for the replat to terminate, it should be conditioned upon the conservation easement going into place so nothing happens in the future that negates the concern that they have at this point. She thought the board has that authority. She thought the topographical problems do exist that would preclude connectivity in the future.

Mr. Kolesar agreed with the applicants and said for them as Planning Commission members, they have to look at the recommendation from the staff, but have to look outside the box at unique areas that are worth saving. He said they all know that the City of Toledo had to shut off their water because of water quality problems. He said this property is part of the headwaters that flow into Lake Erie which he feels is very important. He thanked the applicants for their presentation, as he was a little confused coming into the meeting but understand it much clearer.

Mr. Kolesar moved to approve the applicant's request for the Retreat at Brenelle Replat. In addition, approval is conditioned upon changing the temporary cul-de-sac into a permanent cul-de-sac and terminating the road and the applicant establishing a conservation easement on the adjoining property to the east.

Mr. Henwood said that the conservation easement would be on land that is not part of the Replat. Ms. Bowers said she got that but thought they could still put the condition on. Mr. Henwood said they did not have an application in front of them asking for anything. Ms. Bowers said she still thought they could put the condition on. Mr. Henwood said "yes, ma'am."

Approval is subject to staff comment number one and the comments submitted by the Tax Map Department and the Highway Engineer's office. Mr. Jarrett seconded the motion. Mr. Jeffers opposed. All other members voted AYE and the motion was approved.

B. Coventry Lakes, 106-2014 R, Replat, Granger Township

Mr. Henwood presented the staff report to the Commission for the above captioned subdivision located on the west side of Coventry Lakes Drive at its intersection with Remsen Road at the entrance of the Coventry Lakes subdivision.

The applicant proposes to subdivide Sublot 25 into two, Sublot 25A (4.5585 acres) and Sublot 25B (2.1445 acres).

The subject property is zoned R-1 Residential. The Granger Township Zoning Resolution indicates single family and two family homes are permitted uses (§ 301(B)(1)). The minimum lot size is two acres with a minimum 70-foot lot width and 175 feet of frontage.

Discussion:

There was no discussion.

Mr. Stevenson moved to approve the staff recommendation of Approval with Modifications for Coventry Lakes Subdivision, Replat. Ms. Jesionek seconded the motion. All voted AYE and the motion was approved.

Ms. Bowers stated to Mr. Henwood that she realized that only a portion of the bulb, on Brenelle, was on that property, and she did not know if it would be enforceable or not either, but she did not want them to know that. A conservation easement is a big commitment and 'we' [planning commission] want that. She believes they are going to do it she just did not want them to think there was any wiggle room. Mr. Henwood said the Planning Commission has the ability to make their own decisions. Ms. Bowers said it might not be enforceable, she did not know. Mr. Henwood said his thoughts were it probably was not and was why he said something. Mr. Jarrett commented, "And also we are a recommending board." Mr. Henwood said no, in this instance because it is a Replat, you are not a recommending board, you are the deciding, controlling factor.

C. Westfield Township Text and Map Amendment, 100-101-2014 TA-MA

Mr. Henwood presented the staff report to the Commission for the above captioned text and map amendments **Text:** Article III, Sections 302(B)(1) and (B)(2); **Maps:** Natural Hazard & Overlay Zoning, Natural Hazards, and Zoning Maps.

Proposal: The Westfield Township Board of Trustees initiated the above referenced zoning map and text amendments. The proposal seeks to accomplish the following:

1. Edit the Westfield Township Zoning Resolution, Article III, Sections 302(B)(1) and (B)(2) delete old text and add appropriate references to the new data utilized to create the updated Natural Hazards Overlay Zoning District boundaries.
2. Update the Natural Hazard and Overlay Zoning and Natural Hazards maps with updated data.
3. Update the Zoning District map and the two Natural Hazard maps to accurately reflect changes to the township zoning districts' boundaries caused by expansions to the highway right-of-ways (ROW) at the I-71 and I-76 interchange.

Discussion:

There was no discussion.

Mr. Stevenson moved to approve staff recommendations of Approval with Modifications for the Westfield Township Text Amendment including the correction of staff report. Mr. Jeffers seconded the motion. All voted AYE and the motion was approved.

Mr. Kolesar moved to approve staff recommendation of Approval with Modifications for the Westfield Township Map Amendment. Mr. Stevenson seconded the motion. All voted AYE and the motion was approved.

D. May Minor Subdivision, 097-2014, Wadsworth Township

Mr. Henwood presented the above captioned minor subdivision located in Wadsworth Township to the Planning Commission.

The applicants submitted a Minor Subdivision request to divide the existing 4.9797-acre parcel into 2 lots; the existing house on 2.9957 acres and an additional lot to the north of 1.9840 acres. Both lots will have frontage on Ridge Road (S.R. 94). Northwoods Subdivision, directly east of the proposed minor subdivision, includes a street stub from the subdivision (Mary Anne Drive) directly into the proposed minor subdivision. If the Minor Subdivision were approved, it would preclude the extension of Mary Anne Drive.

The area of the proposed minor subdivision is part of a peninsula of Wadsworth Township bordering the City of Wadsworth. R-3 zoning within the City of Wadsworth is adjacent to the proposed minor subdivision site on the east and C-1 zoning exists to the west. The subject property is zoned R-2 within the Township and the properties directly north and south are zoned R-2.

Discussion:

Ms. Bowers said this is what annexation laws were updated to stop from happening. She said what a nightmare for the City, Township, and the property owner. Mr. Henwood said he got an email from the property owner's realtor. Their intent was to keep the house in the family and sell the lot to the north. If they are unable to do the subdivision then they will sell the entire property.

Mr. Jeffers asked if this were disapproved would the applicant be made aware of the fact that they could come back and do a major subdivision. Mr. Henwood said yes, but one of the things he tries to be wary of in subdivision discussions is financial feasibility and whether this will yield a return that is sufficient in order to justify it. Ms. Bowers said probably not. Mr. Henwood felt this discussion was best left between developers and applicants to deal with. There are inherent risks with doing that and that sort of decision is best left to those people making them. In his mind the question is, is this connection through High Street and Mary Anne Drive worth it and if it is then they cannot approve the lot split. Mr. Henwood said if it is yes, the connection is important and it means automatically no to the minor subdivision, or no it is not important and yes to the subdivision and termination of the street.

Ms. Bowers said there is only one connection to the northwest, and that is where the fire station happens to be located.

Mr. Kolesar asked where Mary Anne Drive was located and how old the subdivision was. Ms. Bowers said between 18-20 years old. Mr. Henwood thought it was platted sometime in the 1980s. Ms. Bowers said that to her the connection makes sense. Mr. Kolesar said to him it does not. It has been there for so long like this. The neighborhood has access through Cherryhill Drive and Stafford Drive on State Road. He said then Mary Anne Drive would be extended on to SR 94, which is heavily travelled and does not have connectivity to an intersection.

Ms. Bowers said the fire station was her concern. Mr. Kolesar appreciated her concern but still did not agree with her. Ms. Bowers said that was okay.

Mr. Henwood stated that the City of Wadsworth expressed pretty strongly that they would like it and the Township did not provide any comment even after requests and phone calls to the trustees. He was not sure what that meant but put that to the board for consideration.

Mr. Jeffers asked if Mr. Henwood knew the distance between Weatherstone and Mary Anne Drive. Mr. Henwood said the intersection site distance is a little sketchy. At that point, you will want 300' to 400' of separation and he was not sure they would get that. Ms. Bowers said it was not there.

Mr. Kolesar said he would look at that, if the long-term plan were to connect Weatherstone and meander Mary Anne down to have an intersection. Mr. Jeffers agreed with Mr. Kolesar.

Ms. Bowers asked if the City has any standing. Mr. Henwood said yes. The authority for the connection lies with the Planning Commission. He said as long as that land is in unincorporated territory that would be the PCs jurisdiction.

Ms. Bowers was not sure but in the Engineering code, she thought it required 400' of separation. Mr. Henwood said it depends on the design speed of the roadway. He said that is why he said between 300' - 400' of separation, which he was confident, was not there. Ms. Bowers knew for a fact it was not there. Mr. Stevenson said he was in that area a lot and thought that area was only about 150-feet. Ms. Bowers said the whole C-1 area from Weatherstone north is about 575-feet total.

Mr. Henwood said the distance between the proposed lot line that would separate the two parcels and the southwestern corner is 239-feet. He said it is less than that to get to Weatherstone.

Mr. Stevenson clarified that if the board were to take staff recommendation and disapprove because they need to leave setbacks and that is what the City wants to continue Mary Anne Lane to High Street, it would not matter because Mary Anne will not be extended to High Street because Mary Anne and Weatherstone are too close to one another. He said allowing Mary Anne to continue to extend to High Street is a moot point because it will never extend. Ms. Bowers said she was not sure. Mr. Henwood said if the land were to be annexed into the City of Wadsworth, then their engineering code is different. He said they could meander and do all sorts of things. He said if that road were to continue straight out and within the City of Wadsworth, you are talking 8-10 lots versus two in the Township.

Ms. Bowers said there are two questions the Planning Commission needs to consider. Number one, can the road connect and number two, should the road connect. Mr. Stevenson said currently that it is unincorporated so he suspected it could not connect because it cannot terminate at High Street because it is too close to Weatherstone. He said there is the potential the City will annex, but no guarantee. He said it is hard to make a decision based on a potential that they someday might annex which would change everything. He said it seemed logical to him that it should not connect because it is dangerous.

Mr. Kolesar moved to not accept staff recommendation of disapproval and accept the applicant's request for the May Minor Subdivision. Mr. Brandon seconded the motion.

Mr. Henwood clarified if he understood correctly then the motion is to allow the minor subdivision to move forward as proposed which precludes the opportunity for the extension. Mr. Kolesar said yes. Mr. Stevenson added that since they are recommending approval of their application it is pending any other recommendation they might have about the maps. Mr. Henwood stated yes, they still have to go through the minor lot procedure.

Ms. Bowers asked Mr. Kolesar if that was part of his motion and Mr. Stevenson's second. He stated yes it was, as did Mr. Stevenson. Mr. Jeffers, Ms. Bowers, and Mr. Jarrett voted NAY. Ms. Jesionek abstained. All other members voted AYE and the motion was approved.

VIII. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Henwood stated that the Engineer's office oversees the Floodplain Regulations for the County in the unincorporated areas. Part of that requires that there be a Board of Appeals for the Floodplain Regulations. He said the way those regulations read the Floodplain Appeals Board members are to be made up of the members of the Planning Commission or their alternates. Mr. Henwood said this has fallen by the wayside and there might be some dispute as to who the Appeals Board members might be. He said he was a member as was Scott Ciupak and Martha Catherwood. According to the rules he no longer can be on the board, Ms. Catherwood is no longer a member of the Planning Commission and Mr. Ciupak requested to be removed from the board [while he was still a PC member].

Mr. Henwood said that was the best appointment of his life. He was on the board for 5 ½ years and maybe had two variances since the regulations had been adopted. He said they might have met five to six times over the whole time he was on the board. Mr. Kolesar, Mr. McNamara, and Mr. Jeffers said they would volunteer to be on the board.

Mr. Henwood did suggest to Dan Willhoite that when he talks to the Commissioner's they might want to broaden the language to include other Medina County residents that were deemed eligible or with appropriate experience.

IX. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There was no Public Participation.

X. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no Other Business.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Bowers moved to adjourn the January 7, 2015 MCPC meeting at 8:10 p.m.

Lynda Bowers, President

Cheryl Heinly, Admin Asst.