

## ARC – August 1, 2022 Review

MEMEBERS PRESENT: Chairman Tim Franklin, Vice Chair Jason Boltz, Curt Smock, Melanie Baker, Nathan Leppo, Bill Weber. Nathan Leppo and Elizabeth Smith were excused.

**ARC-22-08** – Louie Zavarelli, Faith Family Church, 4200 Granger Road, site review, R-2.

**Zoning Comments:** Property is located on the southwest corner of the Granger Road and Crystal Lake Road intersection. The property is surrounded by single-family homes. Mr. Funk shared that the site was approved through the Appearance Review Commission last year. It then went through the Board of Zoning Appeals because it needed a variance for riparian setback and the Board of Zoning Appeals denied the application. One of the concerns was how the church was managing the stormwater; some recommendations to the applicant were made at that meeting. The applicant has since modified the site plan that was approved by this Board last year. So, now the applicant is going back through the process. Louie Zavarelli and Mike Vale will present an overview on the changes and updates. If the site plan review is approved by this Board, then it will go back through the Board of Zoning Appeals process.

Mr. Mike Vale presented to the Commission that the Board of Zoning Appeals had an issue with and recommended requested Bio retention basins on the south portion of the site where the parking lot sheet flows off the site and down towards the stream, even though Summit Soil Water did not require any Bio retention basins. They also did not want the brick pavers; they wanted asphalt and the Bio retention basins. Mr. Vale stated that what they currently submitted is asphalt or an alternate impermeable asphalt. He shared that they are willing to work with the ARC on whatever they want there, they didn't want to come back to the Board without options. He explained where they would have the Bio retention basins via the site plan and landscaping plan on screen. There will be native grasses and trees on the southern perimeter. Due to the depth of the water table, the Bio retention basins are excavation only and only 1 foot working depth for the stormwater management. Mr. Vale stated the sheet flow comes off the parking lot and will go through there and get water quality treatment. This is an improvement on what is currently at the site. Mr. Boltz clarified with Mr. Vale that it will basically overflow, continue onto the creek and make its way into soil and the plantings.

Mr. Weber stated that they are calling it a Bio retention basin yet they are within the floodplains; so, during a serious storm event these things could just be underwater and basically holes in the ground. Mr. Vale agreed but stated that water quality is not for a 100 year storm event either, it is for your two or one year storms. Mr. Weber then asked for dimensions on the proposed paving because he did not see it on any of the drawings. Mr. Vale explained is for 10 spaces that are nine 9' by 18'. Mr. Weber explained that since we had some accidental paving incidents here, he thought there should be dimensions on the site plan to clarify where and what. It was confirmed that the only additional paving being talked about now, whether it be asphalt or pervious materials, it is for the 10 spaces and the sidewalk. Mr. Chairman asked the applicant to add dimensions for the impervious areas.

Mr. Chairman inquired about the landscaping plan and Mr. Vale stated that the landscaping will be the native grasses at the corner of the streams recommended on Summit Soil and Water's website. The trees shown are 10 red Maples and they will over excavate another 18 inches, put in the Bio retention soil media and leave 1 foot of working depth. The hatched section will get the native seeding mixture.

Mr. Boltz asked what the opinions were on asphalt or pervious pavers. Mr. Weber stated that, again we're facing the issue of proposed construction in a riparian corridor, floodplain and it's prohibited in our zoning code and in the comprehensive plan. He said that all of the residents are paying Summit County \$45 every year in order to make up for errors in paving. This site came with these known facts when the property was bought and if the church is the wrong size of the parking spot there then something has to be done: maybe staggered session, busing or something else. The residence all live here under the issue of water retention and flooding and the flood zone is deep and real. Mr. Weber said this is a conditional use in an R-2 neighborhood and the more paving that is placed in the front yard, to him, begins to take on a very

commercial character and in no way blending into the R-2. Mr. Weber strongly felt that approving this would set a bad precedent and sets the stage where the applicant come back for more. He believed that the Bio retention basins belong of the top outside of the flood zone.

Mrs. Baker stated that currently there is paving in some of this area on the proposed site plan and asked how much area is the applicant proposing to expand it by. Mr. Vale pointed out the existing edge on the site plan and stated it is probably about 1/3 of that space is being expanded and 2/3's of it is actually existing. Mr. Vale also pointed out that the Board of Zoning Appeals stated that they wanted asphalt and the Bio retention basins but, he has provided an alternate on this plain of having pervious asphalt. They have no objections to that.

Mr. Chairman asked for the members' opinion on the sidewalk. Mr. Weber said no. Mrs. Baker felt for the safety of people she had no problem with the sidewalk. Mr. Boltz saw some safety fixes in terms of adding a sidewalk to get people off of the drive. He stated it would be a very little impervious area being added and the Bio retention areas are better than what is there now. Mr. Smock was okay with the sidewalk.

Mr. Chairman asked for the members opinion on adding that percentage of asphalt. Mrs. Baker stated she wished she had the exact numbers, i.e., 20, 25, 30%, the higher you go the less she would be happy with it. She did feel the applicant should go with pervious material; it is another way to get better quality of water, you put in a proper system, it allows it to then go into the Bio retention which holds it. On the parking, she would need a number to make a better determination on whether it's 10 spots or less.

Much discussion was had on the ARC's previous recommendation and the pervious pavers, and the fact was stated that it is exactly what the applicant has laid out here; it is the result of trying to get better water quality for all of the parking not just the 10 spots. Regarding the sidewalk, discussion was had on alternatives for it. Mr. Vale stated that the sidewalk is 5 foot wide and goes from edge of pavement to the building. Conversation was had on the elevation of the sidewalk compared to the stoops and the church entrances. Mr. Vale explained this via the exhibits on screen. Mr. Chairman asked the members what their thoughts would be to not having the sidewalk and just have the applicant pave, on the same plane, just asphalt to the building. Mr. Boltz asked how wide the drive aisle was from the parking spaces to the new sidewalk. Mr. Vale said it is never less than 20' wide, but it varies. Mr. Boltz commented about the stoop in the middle of the sidewalk, that goes nowhere, and the fact that the sidewalk is compounding the issue. It being built in a floodplain is the number one issue and he struggled with the 20' something drive aisle. But it's been that way for 60 years and now the plan is to eliminate landscaping and have a building that's paved right up to the edge. Mr. Boltz changed his mind on the sidewalk as he does not see the life safety being solved to the extent he originally thought. Continued conversation was on the steps and the sidewalk and the actual driveway. Mrs. Baker felt strongly that the applicant needs to divide the pedestrians from the parking. Several ideas were suggested and Mr. Zavarelli pointed out the entry doors and explained each one. He stated they try to have everyone go to the front door and they do have security entries for volunteers and people dropping off children.

Mr. Boltz clarified to say that last time the applicant was in, the ARC recommended approval for spaces that are pervious pavers and in acceptance of the L-shaped concrete area. So, the change we are looking at is the possibility of going to asphalt for the 10 spaces, but really the big change is adding site work, on the south of the site up against the creek, which again you're not supposed to be doing anything in the riparian setback. Several suggestions were made, and in conclusion, Mr. Chairman surveyed the members for their feelings on keeping the walkway on the west side and eliminating the one on the south side. Mr. Smock said yes, Mr. Weber said no, Mrs. Baker said yes, and Mr. Boltz said yes.

Regarding the parking spots, Mr. Chairman stated that by doing the pervious, as was originally said, it is still a good idea. He thought it would be better for appearance, for shedding water and maybe we make a stronger case to the Board of Zoning Appeals. Mr. Weber interjected to say pervious pavers need to be maintained, they need to be cleaned out or they become clogged. Mr. Chairman asked the applicant how they would address the maintenance and Mr. Vale stated they had the full maintenance schedule on their

plans. Mr. Smock thought that pervious pavement had durability issues. Mr. Funk shared that at one time the Township had pervious concrete, not pavement. He shared that the concrete had issues. Mrs. Baker stated that pervious pavement is also going to have issues, it is not durable and it doesn't matter what you put underneath it. The applicant's current plan would have to be redesigned because it is not deep enough to support cars. Mr. Boltz and Mr. Chairman both felt that if the applicant was to use pervious pavers, the installation will be key to this project's success. Mr. Chairman inquired as to how the installation could be monitored by or for the Township and Mr. Zavarelli said they would provide photos to document. Mr. Weber remained opposed because the idea in the comp plan is that homeowners aren't even supposed to be cutting trees without permission and here we are granting pavement and excavation. He sees there is paving that exists right now, and keeping with the repaving, allow that portion to be resurfaced and add no more to it. He was really concerned that we will be watching this on a continued basis if you allow paving of any kind in a riparian corridor or a floodplain. Mr. Chairman asked the members their opinion on Mr. Weber's comments on limiting it to the current area of paving versus giving additional spots. Mrs. Baker stated that brings us back to her original question regarding square footage. She would like to see the nice and appropriately marked parking spots, so if the total square footage only gives you seven parking spots, they can put in seven correct parking spots and no more.

Mr. Chairman determined that we will consider this as a work session and asked for revised plans to show the correct, legal parking spaces with dimensions and square footage. Mr. Weber inquired if the applicant could use enlarged, bolder face font, calling out where the riparian and the floodplain are. He added that on page C5 of the plan it would be nice to have this flagged with actual words calling out what they are. The Commission was in agreement to keep the square footage as is and not add to it. Applicant is to come back to the Commission with revised plans.

Regarding the excavation and retention, Mr. Chairman stated that we know they do not have to do this; they were trying to do so to improve the property and the watershed issues. Mr. Chairman asked the members their thoughts were on what the applicant is proposing to add. Mr. Smock was conflicted; he liked the idea of a retention but was unclear how they would hold up in the wintertime. But his thought was that there would be some water quality mitigation there. Mr. Boltz stated that we went from expanding a couple parking spaces to make them more usable to, now we have 20 feet the length of the property of redevelopment that will be disturbing a bigger portion of the site. Mrs. Baker shared that she was torn also and honestly likes the idea of it, as long as they are maintained, it works. She was actually more worried about the native grasses because those are very hard to keep maintained and looking nice. Mr. Vale asked if the Commission had a preference for asphalt the pervious pavers and the members agreed that it should be asphalt if they're not going to do the Bio retention.

Mr. Chairman asked that the applicant adjust the square footage accordingly to correct depth of and width to make safe parking spaces, put in the dimensions of the parking lot and driveways, note the riparian and forward the drawings to the Zoning Staff.

Mr. adjourned the work session.