

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

MINUTES OF JACKSON TOWNSHIP BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING

JANUARY 11, 2010

Pizzino called the meeting to order at 5:02 p.m. at the Jackson Township Hall with all Trustees, Fiscal Officer, Lyon, Fitzgerald, Neftzer, Ruwadi, Boger, Moore and Heck present.

**RESOLUTION 10-001, ATTACHED
SEATING OF TRUSTEE JOHN E. PIZZINO**

Walters moved and Burger seconded a motion to accept the attached Bond, Oath of Office, Certificate of Oath, Certificate of Election and Fiscal Officer’s Notice to Give Bond and Take Oath for Trustee John E. Pizzino. **3-0 yes**

**RESOLUTION 10-002, ATTACHED
SEATING OF TRUSTEE WILLIAM M. BURGER**

Walters moved and Pizzino seconded a motion to accept the attached Bond, Oath of Office, Certificate of Oath, Certificate of Election and Fiscal Officer’s Notice to Give Bond and Take Oath for Trustee William M. Burger. **3-0 yes**

Pizzino turned the meeting over to Fiscal Officer Gonzalez. He opened nominations for Board President.

Burger moved and Walters seconded a motion for John Pizzino as Board President. **3-0 yes**

Pizzino moved and Burger seconded a motion for Jamie Walters as Board Vice President. **3-0 yes**

Gonzalez turned the meeting over to Pizzino.

There was some discussion about changing the time of the meetings.

ATTACHMENT 01/11/10 A

Pizzino moved and Walters seconded a motion to set the 2010 Board of Trustees’ regular meetings on the second and fourth Monday of each month at the Township Hall; 4:00 p.m., Executive Session and/or Work Session; 5:00 p.m., General Session, unless there is a hearing then the hearing would be held at 6:00 p.m. **3-0 yes**

ATTACHMENT 01/11/10 B

Pizzino moved and Walters seconded a motion to approve the 2010 Trustee Representatives as herein attached. **3-0 yes**

CIC – Community Improvement Corporation	Jamie Walters	
CLOUT – Coalition of Large Ohio Urban Twps	Bill Burger	Alt. Randy Gonzalez
Department Head Meetings	All Trustees (rotation)	

Labor Management Meetings:

Fire	Bill Burger	
Highway & Park	Bill Burger	
Office & Clerical	Jamie Walters	
Police (Patrol, Sgts, Lts.)	John Pizzino	
Health Insurance Committee – Trustee	John Pizzino	Alt. Jamie Walters
Health Insurance Committee – Fiscal	Randy Gonzalez	Alt. Debbie Kerr
Recycling Station Board – Trustee Rep.	Bill Burger	
Recycling Board Member	Ron Revlock	
LOGIC – Local Governments in Cooperation	John Pizzino	Ted Heck
	Harley Neftzer	
SCOG – Stark County Council of Govts.	Randy Gonzalez	Alt. Bill Burger
Tax Incentive Review Council – Members	Jamie Walters	Randy Gonzalez
Tax Incentive Review Council – Alternates	Neal Fitzgerald	Marilyn Lyon
Jackson Township Tax Abatement Review	John Pizzino	Randy Gonzalez
Committee Members	Neal Fitzgerald	Marilyn Lyon
Jackson Community Celebration	All Trustees	
Haunted Hayride Committee	All Trustees	

Pizzino moved and Walters seconded a motion to go into Executive Session – Personnel (Appointment/Employment/Compensation) – Information Technology Coordinator. **3-0 yes**

Upon return from Executive Session, Pizzino opened the Work Session

Work Session

Lyon presented the entries in the Township Flag Contest. The Trustees and Fiscal Officer looked at the entries and made their choices for final consideration.

At 6:02 p.m., Pizzino called the General Session to order with all department heads present except Joni Poindexter. Ron Revlock was present for the Zoning Dept. Pizzino requested that all cell phones and pagers be turned off at this time.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Public Speaks – None

Administration Department

ATTACHMENT 01/11/10 C

Walters moved and Burger seconded a motion to adopt and authorize the placement of the Board President’s signature upon the attached Agreements with Aultra Administrative Group. **3-0 yes**

Walters moved and Burger seconded a motion to authorize the Board’s signatures on the negotiated agreement with the Fraternal Order of Police, Lieutenants. **3-0 yes**

Lyon recommended reducing the frequency of publishing the Township Newsletter from four times per year to three as a cost-saving measure. The cost savings would be about \$10,000 per year.

ATTACHMENT 01/11/10 D

Walters moved and Burger seconded a motion to reduce the number of times the newsletters are issued from four to three per year. **3-0 yes**

ATTACHMENT 01/11/10 E

Pizzino moved and Burger seconded a motion to approve the appropriation transfer request from account code 101.110.5387, Discretionary, to account code 101.110.5432, Computer Related Services, in the amount of \$1,550.00. **3-0 yes**

ATTACHMENT 01/11/10 F

Walters moved and Burger seconded a motion to appoint 2010 Citizens advisory Committee members in accordance with the attached list. **3-0 yes**

Highway/Traffic – Ralph Boger, Highway Superintendant

Meetings: Quarterly

Members: 1. James Donze
2. Richard Evans
3. Klaus Kuttrus
4. John Nedelk
5. Janice Spadone

Park – Dave Ruwadi, Park/Operations Director

Meetings: Monthly

Members: 1. James Bauder
2. Michael Moss
3. Steve Rohr
4. Lawrence Rohrig
5. Millie Stergios
6. Steve Studer

Central Maintenance Department

ATTACHMENT 01/11/10 G

Pizzino moved and Burger seconded a motion to approve the appropriation transfer request from account code 101.115.5120, Overtime, to account code 101.115.5110, Regular Salaries, in the amount of \$5,541.54. **3-0 yes**

Fire Department

RESOLUTION 10-003, ATTACHED AMBULANCE BILLING POLICY

Walters moved and Burger seconded a motion whereas, on February 9, 2009, in Resolution No. 09-006, we adopted an amended policy for an ambulance and emergency medical services fee.

Be it resolved that, we hereby adopt the attached amended ambulance and emergency medical service fee policy and that Resolution No. 09-006 is hereby replaced by this Resolution. **3-0 yes**

RESOLUTION 10-004, ATTACHED EMS CHARGES BILLING AGREEMENT

Walters moved and Burger seconded a motion to adopt and authorize the placement of our signatures upon the attached EMS Charges Billing Agreement with the City of Massillon. **3-0 yes**

RESOLUTION 10-005, ATTACHED STATE OF OHIO LEASE

Walters moved and Burger seconded a motion to adopt and authorize the placement of our signatures upon the attached Lease with the State of Ohio. **3-0 yes**

Highway Department

ATTACHMENT 01/11/10 H

Walters moved and Burger seconded a motion to adopt and authorize the placement of our signatures upon the attached 2009 Township Highway System Mileage Certification. **3-0 yes**

ATTACHMENT 01/11/10 I

Pizzino moved and Burger seconded a motion to approve the appropriation transfer request from account code 204.310.5387, Discretionary, to account code 204.310.5464, Liability Insurance, in the amount of \$2,635.55, from account code 204.310.5387, Discretionary, to account code 204.310.5460, Fleet Insurance, in the amount of \$4,628.61, from account code 204.310.5387, Discretionary, to account code 204.310.5462, Building Insurance, in the amount of \$1,223.46.

3-0 yes

ATTACHMENT 01/11/10 J

Walters moved and Burger seconded a motion to adopt and authorize the placement of the Board President's signature upon the attached change order #4 from Cornerstone Electric, Inc. for the Fulton/Wales Streetscape Project. **3-0 yes**

ATTACHMENT 01/11/10 K

Walters moved and Burger seconded a motion to adopt and authorize the placement of the Board President's signature upon the attached change order #5 from Cornerstone Electric, Inc. for the Fulton/Wales Streetscape Project. **3-0 yes**

Legal Department

ATTACHMENT 01/11/10 L

Walters moved and Burger seconded a motion not to request a hearing on the transfer of the liquor license to Punjob Farm, Inc., dba BP, 5467 Wales Ave NW, Massillon, OH 44646. **3-0 yes**

ATTACHMENT 01/11/10 M

Walters moved and Burger seconded a motion not to request a hearing on the transfer of the liquor license to Maha Kali Inc., 4625 Portage Rd., North Canton, OH 44720. **3-0 yes**

Park Department

ATTACHMENT 01/11/10 M

Walters moved and Burger seconded a motion, pursuant to ORC Section 505.10, to adopt and authorize the placement of the Board President's signature upon the attached Proposal from Baker Vehicle Systems. **3-0 yes**

Police Department

RESOLUTION 10-006, ATTACHED JAIL TRANSPORTATION AGREEMENT

Walters moved and Burger seconded a motion to adopt and authorize the placement of our signatures upon the attached Jail Transportation Agreement with the City of Massillon. **3-0 yes**

ATTACHMENT 01/11/10 O

Pizzino moved and Walters seconded a motion to approve the appropriation transfer request from account code 209.250.5387, Discretionary, to account code 209.250.5464, Liability Insurance, in the amount of \$115.00, and from account code 209.250.5485, Electric, to account code 209.250.5480, Telephone, in the amount of \$2,386.50. **3-0 yes**

Fiscal Office

ATTACHMENT 01/11/10 P

Pizzino moved and Burger seconded a motion to pay the bills in the amount of \$1,838,549.73. **3-0 yes**

ATTACHMENT 01/11/10 Q

Pizzino moved and Burger seconded a motion to approve the minutes of the December 14, 2009 Board of Trustees meeting. **3-0 yes**

ATTACHMENT 01/11/10 R

Pizzino moved and Burger seconded a motion to approve the December 2009 year-end Financial Reports. **3-0 yes**

Routine Business

Announcements

- Next regular Board of Trustees meeting, January 25, 2010, 4:00 p.m. Executive Session and/or Work Session, 6:00 p.m., General Session, Township Hall.
- CIC meeting, January 19, 2010, 5:00 p.m., Township Hall.
- LOGIC meeting, February 4, 2010, 9:00 a.m., Safety Center, Chiefs' Conference Room.
- Zoning Commission, January 21, 2010, 5:00 p.m., Township Hall.
- Citizens Advisory Committees:
 - Community Celebration, January 12, 2010, 5:30 p.m., Township Hall.
 - Park, February 9, 2010, 6:30 p.m., Township Hall.
 - Highway/Traffic, February 17, 2010, 6:30 p.m., Township Hall.
- The Jackson Township Flag Contest winner will be announced at the Trustees' meeting on January 25, 2010.

Old Business – None

New Business

Walters moved and Burger seconded a motion to accept a \$500.00 sponsorship donation to the Community Celebration from Buehler's. **3-0 yes**

Public Speaks – Open Forum

No one came forward.

Pizzino called a five minute recess before opening the Public Hearing.

At 6:30 p.m., Pizzino opened the public hearing for Glenmoor PUD revisions to general development plan. Pizzino turned the meeting over to Walters. He explained that since he is a homeowner at Glenmoor our legal counsel advised him to recuse himself.

Walters: I'll go ahead and open the portion of the hearing for those who are in favor of this proposal and ask those who want to speak to please come up to the podium and state your name

and your address. Once we're done with those who are in favor, we'll move to those who may have opposition.

My name is Barbara Bennett. I'm one of the partners at Hammontree and Associates. We're engineers and surveyors and I'm representing Glenmoor Properties and Heritage Development and I also have Rob Benjamin here with Glenmoor Properties. I want to talk about the overall project and what you are deciding on is a revision to the general development plan and we have zoomed out to the entire 408 acres. The part that we are asking for a revision is highlighted in green, which is a very small part of the overall development. Just to give you a little bit of background on the project, it's been around since 1991 and we are looking at phase 21 of this development. There will be one more phase after this. This particular revision was submitted through Regional Planning and received conditional approval. There is nothing that can't be accommodated in their conditions of approval and I'm hoping that you have that in your packet there. Some of the conditions of approval included the subdivision engineer. He's the one who reviews the drainage and traffic and utilities. His main comment was 'make sure that additional downspout connectors are added for the additional lots'. He had no comment in regards to different storm water management than what is already in the ground. This particular phase of the development, the infrastructure has been constructed, it is in the ground. There have been nine lots that have been platted and they've been up for sale and market for the past two years. And as you can see those nine lots are still vacant. To the best of my knowledge there has not been one single offer on those nine lots. We are asking to revise nine to thirteen lots so we're adding four lots. Looking at the PUD zoning requirements when this project was initiated we were allowed eight units per acre maximum. With what is approved, we only have 1.11 units per acre overall. With this revision that we're asking for, it would be 1.12 units per acre. So we are well below the maximum threshold on density allowed when you're looking at the overall project. When you're looking at zoning a big question that always comes up is the drainage. As I stated before, the storm sewer system is in place. It is adequate to accommodate the four additional lots. Again, that was reviewed on a preliminary basis through the Stark County Subdivision Engineer and he has not requested any modification to our storm water management or storm water utilities.

Another one of the conditions of approval that came up was accommodating fire safety forces in particular, specific notes and things that Chief Heck has requested. These are parts of the conditions of approval so the Township, if this was to go to plat, the Township has the authority to review the certain elements that needed to be completed and made sure that they were completed to your satisfaction before plat was recorded. Some of the elements included access off of Brunnerdale through the maintenance area making sure it's 20 foot wide, fire access noted access to the gates, making sure that there is hard surface accessible to some of the flag lots off the end of the cul-de-sac, and some other general notes that we've discussed in detail with Chief Heck and are included on the preliminary plat.

Under the strong advisement of Mr. Pizzino, we did meet with the adjoining neighbors to the east, off of Hilldale and Fleetwood. We had an informal informational meeting on December 17. We had seven people attend and for the most part the neighbors would rather see nine versus thirteen lots. There's no denying that and I'm sure they'll speak to that effect when they get the opportunity. There is an offer of buffering along that corridor to kind of minimize the visual

impact of having homes looking right off of the roadway. It's hard to see, but this is an aerial photo of the existing conditions and was able to review a little bit with Mrs. Sheetz, she's the corner property over here on the far south. And there's a mixture of evergreens and ornamental grasses along there. We have a graduate landscape architect on staff that developed this. So this is a concept so you don't have a row of trees the same looking uniform kind of look, but more interest and esthetically pleasing to kind of, again, buffer that visual between the neighbors and the new homes that would go up at Glenmoor.

Some of the other comments from the neighborhood meeting had to do with the concerns about drainage and runoff, not only on this section but on future sections and, again, that will be a future issue. There were some concerns about the way landscaping was maintained and commitment from Glenmoor to pursue that and make sure that gets accomplished. And some of the property owners were interested in getting their property corners marked, which we were able to do. Glenmoor paid for that, also. So those are basically the technical ends of what we're asking. I wanted to demonstrate that we are in compliance with the zoning code. And we are here because of your zoning code, I guess the determination was made that we were not in substantial compliance to the original development plan be adding these four lots. That's an interpretation. I guess I might have a different interpretation. With that I'd like to turn it over to Mr. Benjamin to talk about the vacant lots and why we are pursuing this.

Thank you, Barb. My name is Rob Benjamin. I'm vice-president of Heritage Development Company. I manage Glenmoor Properties real estate for Heritage Development Company as well as I manage Barrington up in Aurora, which is also a gated golf course community, and several other residential communities around Cleveland as well as in Florida.

This is all my idea. So if there's anybody to point fingers at, or talk to, this is my idea as being a marketing and sales person for this development. As you know, and Barb well noted, is that we did put this sub-division in and we did have one offer on lots which actually turned out to be a ridiculous offer, but that is today's world. Today's world is you're getting offers that are fifty – sixty percent of value of what someone might be set for a price or maybe even what they bought that property for several years ago. It's a very difficult time. We all know that, I'm not here to play a violin or have somebody play it for me or cry for me, but the reality of it is that one of the areas that seems to be very popular and that several residents have said to us and several people that have looked in our development is they would like to see more of a property like the Cloisters that is already developed in Glenmoor. Though these lots will be bigger, that's what in the Cloisters the similar type of architecture and floor plans are what we're looking to do. As you've heard, all through the last few years is the baby boomers are growing up and we have an aging population, more and more people want first floor masters. They want very nice downstairs and they want some bedrooms upstairs for possibilities of family as well as friends that would visit them. Other people like to build ranches with no bedrooms so nobody comes to visit them. But that's the reality. People do like to have big ranches as well as they like to finish their lower level for grandkids and kids and so on. So, this is something we think very simply can be done in this area because the architecture, the plans, are already there. And they've been successfully sold in the development and we think this can continue in this area here.

On the technical side, we think we can meet everything as Barb said. I'm committed to doing that as well as the owner is. What we're really looking to is a net increase of four lots. The lots will range from 84 to 105 foot wide, they will still be as deep as they are now. What we're trying to do create something that will give another opportunity for a buyer to come into Glenmoor and buy. We have 30 single family lots remaining in the development that are already developed and for sale. We have not had a contract or a sale on a single family lot in Glenmoor in a year. We have had activity in the Cloisters, we've had activity in, and I'm saying new construction or buying a new lot. We have activity in the Hamlets. These are a little bit lower price products. As well as we just built a brand new model in Hamlets II which Perry Campanelli just finished which has come out very, very nice and we've gotten very good activity on that. But that's a totally different product than the Cloisters. But even in that particular visitor that comes into the Hamlets, there are a lot of people that don't necessarily want a house that's attached to another one. So they still want their own property, they still want their own house. And this is still going to be single family lots that will be fee simple ownership where the group can get together and create some benefits by hiring the same landscaper to cut their grass, the same group to plow their snow, and the same group to do their plant and bed management around their houses. So they can get some advantage by doing that which is very similar to what they do in the Cloisters today.

These are not going to be condominiums and we're not attaching any homes. We feel that it will be very nice looking because it's a proven product in the development. So that's what we're asking for is to increase the amount of lots, we think that, I don't have an agreement signed with Perry but I believe Perry will be the builder of this section, it is his interest level but I don't have a signed contract with Perry but I can tell you, meeting with him and talking with him and he was also at the meeting back at Glenmoor a few weeks ago is that I believe he's committed to putting up a model there like he's done in the Hamlets and decorating like he's done in the Hamlets that will bring people to the development that will not only bring more people into the association, will bring potential members to the club, but it's more residents that can be in the development. Obviously, our goal as a developer and my goal as manager of sales and the development is we would like to finish and sell off the development. That's the bottom line, that's what we're in business for. I know there's going to be some residents here that going to object. I know there are residents and other people that I've talked to that do object but we feel that we will do a very nice job and we hope that you will approve our request.

I'll be happy to answer any questions. I also do have floor plans of our existing Cloisters if you do want to see those. And I have two different types of plans and elevations on that as well.

Walters: Mr. Burger, does anybody else have any questions? Is there anyone else wishing to speak in favor?

Unidentified person: I'd like a little clarification on the access road for the fire. Do you have that planned out where that's going to be or how that's going to.

Bennett: Yes, the access road will basically follow the maintenance road that's in place right now. Obviously, it's not to be used as a cut through for the general public or the residents. It's only for fire access. It will come off of Brunnerdale by the maintenance area and then

Unidentified person: That's not going to be gated. Correct?

Bennett: It will be gated.

Unidentified person: (Indecipherable) gated.

Bennett: Yes, as long as the fire department has the proper access codes or card or key.

Unidentified person: So it will go right through the building like it's going now.

Bennett: Correct. There's a couple of sheds I believe that need to be taken down to make sure that appropriate 20 foot width is there. So we'll need to take a, I think, it's like a car port that maybe holds mulch or something. So one of those bays will be taken down.

Pizzino: Mrs. Bennett.

Bennett: Yes, sir.

Pizzino: Again, I'm not going to be part of the voting on this but I think you should explain. Chief Heck was in a meeting with you about the access road. So you might want to let the Chief talk about that a little bit.

Bennett: Sure. There were very specific points

Pizzino: (Indecipherable)

Bennett: Yes. Very specific points.

Heck: Main point is the fact that all our concerns were addressed and included in the final phase to RPC. One of the items was the access, that we would have a secondary means of entrance into that portion of the development. Not only for what's being proposed here but existing residents in the event that we would be working at another section, experience has shown that we block the roads, people have to go to work, visitors and people drive across yards, they do whatever they can to try vacate a facility or get into a facility. So we wanted that second access, which we have. It's a twenty foot fire lane, that's the code in the State of Ohio. They've assured us that will be put in. There's a building that's going to have to be relocated. Also, that we have access to a Knox box, this is a storage box that we use throughout the community for access to keys that we can open that gate as a secondary gate if we need to get in. And that we would also be able to come in to this proposed development and be able to service the lots that are going to be flag type units. Wide enough to support the fire trucks and the weight of the fire trucks and that would be on the deed restrictions that go with the property.

Unidentified person: How far does that road have to be away from current property?

Pizzino: Mr. Revlock, there's no restrictions (indecipherable).

Bennett: I don't think there's a minimum but you, obviously, need to have enough distance to actually construct the road and grade it at the proper grade and everything, so.

Revlock: There's an access there that goes now through the maintenance operation and there's a section of a gravel road that goes into the part of the development.

Bennett: I think the golf course maintenance crews are using it now.

Revlock: Right.

Bennett: And Chief needs something a little more substantial.

Heck: Yes, that existing roadway that is there now for maintenance it going to have to be increased to support and give us the width that we need to come into that portion of the development. It will be to the west of the existing maintenance facility. We'll use the existing road that's there to come into the maintenance facility, if we need to. If we find other accesses blocked, we will come in that way and use the roadway that's built to the west of the maintenance facility now.

Bennett: The aerial photo shows where the existing gravel drive is.

Unidentified person: Yes, but my concern is, well two things, the overflow for the pond which goes underneath there (indecipherable) make sure that wasn't disturbed cause that (indecipherable) over the years. There's a bank right now which you guys actually built to kind of separate us from them, I don't think we'd want that disturbed, either, so you'd have to go to the south to extend that road. I would like to see (indecipherable).

Walters: All right, anybody else that would like to speak in favor of the proposal? In that case, we'll close that portion of the hearing and we'll move to the portion of the hearing where we have an opportunity to speak against the proposal. So again, anyone who wishes to speak against the proposal or ask some questions, please come up to the lectern and give us your name and address and we'll work through the discussion.

Gonzalez: I'm going to ask you to read your name and address into the record, please.

My name is Larry Adelman. My address is 4590 Armandale. My wife and I own the residence. We've lived in there, we purchased the lot and built the home about 7 to 8 years ago, much prior to the construction of the street, Lismore, at this time. As we view it, it appears that the proposed change that the applicant is asking for is actually twofold. One to increase the number of lots from nine to thirteen and secondly, to change the nature or to cloister like or smaller homes – condo like homes – but not attached.

The reason why we are against and really the sole reason is very significant and to us it would result in a substantial lessening of the value to our home. It certainly was not contemplated when we bought the lot or built our home that homes that would be a fraction of the cost of my home would be fifty to sixty yards from my existing home. Like most people, our home is our greatest

asset that we have. We recognize that the developer/builder, or the developer, excuse me, his reasons are economic. Well, mine, too, are economic. This would be a substantial impacting on the value of my home. For example, on Armandale there are presently four homes that would roughly parallel the proposed development on the four homes, I think five lots originally, one home has two lots. So you can see that with four homes opposite that would thirteen homes or three times as many, so you can imagine the impact on these fairly large homes that these smaller homes would have on our property values. So it would significantly impact in that regard. Also, if we can go on the basis of the cloisters presently in Glenmoor, they're approximately one third the price, so it would just be devastating to the value of my home and my neighbors homes. That is the price disparity would be about three times the difference.

Another reason why it would impact on us on the lessening of our value is simply aesthetics. The present homes along Armandale, which are opposite Lismore, are individual homes, each one has its own character. Well, the cloister type condos that are proposed would be very much uniform. We think that character adds to the value of our home and makes it certainly unique and adds value to it. And I think also on that point that the original developer of Glenmoor spoke to that when he developed it. He made certain distinct areas, one is called the Enclave, one is called the Estates, one is call the Super Estates and is the Hamlets. Each area is distinct unto itself. This proposal represents a hundred and eighty degrees from that concept where you'd have a mixing of these concepts of the condo – cloister or smaller home with a larger home. And we think that certainly defeats the intent of the original developer and as the representative of the proposed development said, his attempts are – it's just four more. Well, this four more would substantially impact because you'd have this mixing and the smaller lots which we feel would negatively impact on our values. Thank you.

Walters: Thank you.

Revlock: Mr. Adelman, can you show us on this map where your home is?

Gonzalez: Do you have that pointer, John?

Pizzino: It's on the other side of the golf course.

Adelman: We're on the corner, Glengarry and Armandale.

Mrs. Adelman: It shows up better on the previous one. Put the previous one back up. (Indecipherable) the scope of our house is on a 7,000 square feet.

Gonzalez: Slide it down some.

Mrs. Adelman: Pull it down. Pull the map down. There's our house up on the corner. Seven thousand square feet. And

Mr. Adelman: We're directly opposite.

Mrs. Adelman: Next to it is a second home, then the third home, those would be the three large homes that would be, their views out the back would be of homes approximately a third the size, a third the value. Now for the Cloisters that would be great. They have these little homes looking into million dollar homes, but we would have the view of just you know a very small all looking the same type of structure. We had anticipated as I said similar homes to our own (indecipherable) look out and see beautiful homes and. Aren't happy.

Walters: All right. Mr. Benjamin, could I ask you a couple questions?

Benjamin: Sure.

Walters: What would, under the currently approved plan of nine lots and houses, what would you estimate the approximate value of something that would be built on those versus the cost of what would be built on the proposal.

Benjamin: I can tell you first of all, on the Cloisters there has been some lots that people have or homes that people have bought two and there has been homes that have been six, seven, eight hundred plus in there. So the lots now that are we have them marketed at start at \$165,000. So generally speaking it's about four to one.

Walters: Okay.

Benjamin: As to value. But that's generally speaking maybe yesterday's times, maybe not today's times. So it all depends but I don't have a market at this point that that's looking at that.

Walters: But ordinarily so you would say somewhere in the range of half a million to three quarters of a million perhaps in that general range.

Benjamin: Yes. I mean, I think one house along the fairway there just sold, I think, in the \$650,000 range. Which I do know that in the Cloisters there have been homes that have been built in that price range as well.

Walters: Okay. Alright, anyone else wishing to speak in opposition, please come up to the podium.

Unidentified person: I would just like to note that at the present time there are no fewer than

Walters: I really need you to come up here and state your name and address so we can make sure we get your remarks.

I'm Maryann Konan. I live at 3889 Woodleigh Ave. NW, in the Cloisters. And my property overlooks the Timken farm. It's one of the original Cloisters. I just wanted to say at this time, if you check the records or the market, there are no fewer than seven properties within the Cloisters that are for sale at this time. Also, I think that the lowest value of any home in the Cloisters, I think you will find that just recently they had difficulty securing \$239,000 for one of the smaller properties. True, there are two larger properties with significantly larger homes on them but I

believe its Mrs. Carol David owns one of those. And there's another one down the street from me on Woodleigh I believe that sold at one time for close to \$8,000 but that was in a different market altogether.

Walters: \$800,000, right?

Konan: Okay?

Walters: Thank you.

Unidentified person: I think you also have to remember

Walters: Can you please

Unidentified person: (indecipherable) we're going to see the backs of the houses. Not the fronts.

Walters: Anybody else wishing to speak in opposition please come up.

My name is Remesh Krishnamurthi. I live at 4618 Armandale. I'm directly next door to the Adelmans. As you can see there on the picture. Larry stated everything, I'm in full agreement with. I think that this change will very much change the distinctive beauty of the neighborhood by changing them from single family, larger dwellings to multiple, smaller homes that have a very similar look about them. That's all I have to say.

Walters: Okay, thank you. Sir.

Good evening, everyone, my name is Mark Sheras. I live at 4642 Armandale Ave. NW. It's right next to the Krishnamurthi's. The big difference between our family and the Krishnamurthi's and the Adelman's is that we recently came to Glenmoor and we're very happy that we did, however, had and at the time that those properties were zoned when we purchased in May, those properties were zoned at nine. And that actually calculated into the purchase of our home. Had we seen thirteen properties across the way, there's no way that we would have gone for that particular property. And again the argument that I have is exactly the same as my neighbors. Transforming that from nine properties to thirteen properties will definitely have an impact, a negative impact on the property values of our home. And also it will diminish the aesthetics and the main reason that we decided to buy on that thirteenth fairway was because of how beautiful it was. So I would certainly plead with you to give that some consideration as you're deliberating on this particular matter. Thank you very much.

Walters: Thank you.

Gonzalez: Left a lot of golf balls in your back yard.

Okay, I'll be on the record. You also must take into consideration. Sherry Adelman, 4590 Armandale Ave. NW. That we will be looking at the backs of the condos, the cloisters. The aesthetics of the front of the Cloisters are nice, you know. And they are way closer together than what we're used to. But when he mentions a lot of the lots that haven't sold a lot of those lots

are lots that are behind the Cloisters. If you come in the Hills & Dales entrance and you come to the stop sign, there's a lot in front of you, another lot, these are single family lots that haven't sold, and then a single family home that sold a few years ago at auction because it wouldn't sell then, then another empty lot. These are all facing the back of the Cloisters. It's just not what you want for your view if you're going to build an expensive home. So I think you need to take into consideration, we would be seeing the backs of the homes.

Walters: Okay. Thank you. Anyone else that wishes to make a statement in opposition to the proposal.

Loren Petry, I live at 6311 Bertram Ave., also a Glenmoor resident. I stand in opposition to the proposal also. And I guess I represent the rest of the people that don't live right next to this. Cause I live away from it. But it really is not in keeping with the standard that we, you know, that we feel that we have in Glenmoor. At a time and an economy, when all of us are concerned with our housing values, this certainly is not going to do anything to enhance those at all. In fact it will denigrate them, because of the fact of more densely populated cloister. It's a fine establishment but not on a golf course. These are golf course lots and that's not in keeping with what we see there. The other thing, I'm also a representative on the Glenmoor home owners association and I was not aware that there was going to be any type of a gate involved in this where there would be more access to the development, is that correct?

Benjamin: It's just a gate requested by the Fire Chief.

Heck: It's only for emergency access that we would use under

Petry: But that means we have to run cable and video and every – well if we're going

Heck: It's a gate that is a secured gate that we would have a key to

Petry: Okay. So it's not similar to what we have

Heck: (Indecipherable) It's only for emergency purposes.

Petry: I just wanted to make sure. Then I'm done. Thank you.

Pizzino: Thanks Loren.

Walters: Anybody else that would like to speak in opposition?

I'm Carolyn Sheetz and I'm on the other side of the pond. All I'm going to say is I'm opposed to the thirteen. We've been told before that it was nine and that the wetlands it would be cut off if it would have gone straight through, I'd have been hollering and yelling, but the wetlands stopped it and so that it's not a straight through so it can be a dragstrip for the young kids up there. I've seen kids come around those roads sitting on the door having fun and I think 'Oh my God' and I think 'okay if that would be back that street'. I didn't oppose the street or anything, I just am saying that I hope that, well the one thing, the Cloisters up there is in a circle. This is in

a straight line. They have the nine lots up there, they don't show the thirteen lots that they want up there, that are proposed like you know, they're going to be angled and it's going to be like a brick wall.

Unidentified person: I have a picture of them.

Sheetz: I totally understand where Mr. Adelman's coming from and all the people in there, it's going to look horrible from their side because they have the back end of the place. We're looking at the front of the homes. And I just hope that, you know, you guys look at this and take it under consideration because these people have put a lot of money into their properties and I've got a, you know, we've got a property investment on our side, too. But just take it under consideration that I oppose.

Walters: Thank you. Anybody else? In that case, we'll close that portion of the hearing. Mr. Revlock, I know you've sat through a number of these hearings, Regional Planning and we've got the conditional approval documentation in front of us. What is your recommendation, how do you see this?

Revlock: You're correct, Mr. Walters. I've sat through a lot of these requests in the past and I also belong to RPC so I've seen it from that side of the fence. The developer has met a lot of the conditions that were asked of him in the past and now if you note in your paperwork there's additional requirements that will control the flooding and there are several conditions that they have to meet now as a result of the December RPC list of recommendations. I certainly can understand the side of the property owners. From what I hear, the biggest objection is on the west side of the homes as it was pointed out, the back of the homes, is, I don't know if there is going to be any screening there, I know, Mrs. Bennett said, or maybe it was Mr. Benjamin, that there was going to be screening on the east side, screening from the Sheetz property.

Benjamin: (Indecipherable) Every homeowner has the ability to landscape their home (indecipherable).

Revlock: I understand that, but

Benjamin: I guess I, to be honest I have not looked at that but there is some (indecipherable) that already has trees on it, in that back section that was done by the golf course. So we could certainly look at that, you know. I know some of the neighbors on the other side where we talk about the pond, they didn't want a wall of trees which we're willing to mix up the materials and mix up the plantings and trees and can certainly look at buffering on the other side as well.

Revlock: I just pointed that out because that's what I hear over and over.

Benjamin: There is mounding there and there are trees scattered throughout that area.

Revlock: From a zoning and RPC side of the regulations, I feel the developer has met the requirements and still has requirements that he has to meet conditionally and I would recommend from the zoning aspect that we approve this.

Walters: All right. Mrs. Lyon, I know we haven't talked a whole lot about it here but there's often questions of drainage. Have you had any contact with Mr. Underwood or anyone else that in regards to drainage and issues or concerns there.

Lyon: I did talk to Joe Underwood last week and he reiterated the conditions that he placed on the developer through Regional Planning. He felt that the development could be built with some minor modifications, some of the calculations would have to be redone and the plans would have to be submitted to him and then he would have to review them and approve them before they would be able to get the go ahead. But he did give his conditional approval if they do meet the conditions.

Walters: All right. Ron do you have anything else?

Revlock: No, that's all I have.

Walters: Chief? Ralph, anything?

Boger: No, the roadway is already in. That's the only part I would be affected by.

Walters: All right. These are never easy decisions or easy issues we have to decide on. Mr. Burger do you have any questions or any thoughts?

Burger: Well, looking at the overlay that I have here on, I believe it would be the west side of these lots in question, it looks like there are some trees planted on there and it looks like a lane or whatever. Is that an access to the golf course to go to different holes?

Benjamin: (Indecipherable) park

Walters: Yes, that's a cart path.

Burger: Okay. That answers that part of my question. I don't have a scale here that I've noticed but from the back of these lots that are going from one through eight or nine down there, how much excess is there between the back of those properties and that access road there for golf carts or whatever. I didn't see a scale on here, yes, I did, here it is, one inch to 200 feet.

Pizzino: (Indecipherable)

Burger: Right, I understand that all golf course but this little strip in here from the.

Pizzino: Yes, that's a cart path.

Burger: That's a cart path, right, okay. So, the distance between the cart path and these lots here wouldn't be quite 200 feet.

Pizzino: I think his question is from the cart path, buffer zone to the where the property line ends, what's your distance. Isn't that your question, Mr. Burger?

Burger: Yes. It looks like, I don't

Benjamin: I think it's a (indcipherable)

Burger: Yes, it does.

Bennett: (Indcipherable) narrow looks 20 feet, the widest point looks about 50 feet.

Burger: Yes, that would

Benjamin: We have a forty foot setback (indcipherable) golf course property (indcipherable)

Burger: I was questioning

Pizzino: (Indcipherable) three houses

Burger: This space here between the golf cart trail and the back of these property lots here.

Pizzino: I'm just helping Mr. Burger because I live there and just trying to answer his question. And his question is basically from the golf cart path, the buffer zone now to where the lots are going to end, the rear of the new allotment.

Bennett: (Indcipherable) about 20 feet, (indcipherable) 50 feet.

Burger: Yes, the rear of the new allotment. Anywhere from 20 to 50 feet. Okay, thank you.

Walters: Mr. Gonzalez, do you have anything.

Gonzalez: I just wanted, usually I wouldn't be speaking on this, but this is kind of close to my heart. When I was a Township Trustee, Glenmoor was built and it was really the pride of the community, I mean, it was the jewel of the community. And it was the first planned unit development and there was a lot of controversy over it at the time about the building of that maintenance shed. We actually changed the law to suit this. I guess I feel very strongly on the point that it's just what it's called, a planned unit development. As a Trustee, I felt it was great idea because it really did give us control, as the Trustees have today, over the whole unit and development. So you couldn't go in there and decide we're going to put this maintenance shed somewhere else. It's the one place where they can say if they're going to build a building, it has to look like the building that they're going to show. You can't do that with other forms of zoning, so I felt that your arguments are very, I guess I'm very attenuated to that. The fact is, is it a planned unit development, you bought it, and you looked at it overall, what the development was supposed to look like. And the process is working exactly like it's supposed to be working.

Walters: All right. Well, like I said, these are never easy choices, particularly when you have neighbors and adjoining property owners that aren't in favor of the plan. I don't know how Mr. Burger feels at this point, but I'm not seeing anything that gives me enough pause to not provide the approval that's being requested. Mr. Burger.

Burger: Well, I have mixed emotions, not probably as mixed as what the people are here opposed to this. Unfortunately, I kind of grew up in that area and I remember when it was Brunnerdale Seminary and the property was being farmed by the boys that went to school there. Some of the neighbors that lived on Brunnerdale, some of the Sheetz', I see their names here, Konans, I'm not sure which Konans you're related to, but happens to be my wife's mother was a Konan, too. I think that was where they were raised. It's a very difficult situation. I appreciate the work that the zoning people do, not knowing how the land is going to be developed when they started zoning the Township. I am lucky enough that my property that I bought when I got married was seven acres. It had a small barn and a good sized home there. And fortunately, by having seven acres nobody was able to build within reasonable distance because of the zoning that was at that time on the books. I was very familiar, like I say, when Brunnerdale was being run by the boys that were going there to become priests. The dairy cattle, they had their own farms where they raised most of the products that kept the Brunnerdale Seminary functioning at that time. My heart goes out to people because I would never fully be able to understand your feelings, I think I do but when you went in there and bought that property, your dreams were set very high. Unfortunately, with the zoning the Trustees have to work with and so forth, the burden comes back to the three Trustees, Regional Planning, our zoning and so forth. I'm not a big Bible reader but years ago I remember reading in the Bible about cutting peoples fingers off, cut their ears off and things like this because they didn't get their own way. I find it very hard to judge these because you have your dreams and the people that bought this property here have their dreams and where do you draw the line. I guess that will be up to me to listen to any other comments, pro and con, that I have to vote on this thing. But so be it, I'll be very fair in my judgement on how the rest of the Board members and so forth and any other comments that are made to the Board here. So that's all I have to say right now.

Walters: Thank you, Mr. Burger. Neal, I need to make a motion.

Fitzgerald: Someone makes a motion and Bill can second it whether he, you can put a motion on the floor.

Walters: Just a simple motion of approval or disapproval?

Fitzgerald: Approval of the PUD Plan Amendment or denial, either one. Approval or denial of the proposed plan amendment.

Walters moved and Burger seconded a motion to approve the revisions to the previously approved R-6 Planned Unit Development as attached.

Walters	yes
Pizzino	abstained
Burger	yes

Walters closed the Glenmoor PUD hearing.

Pizzino moved and Walters seconded a motion to adjourn

3-0 yes

John Pizzino

Randy Gonzalez