

**KENT PLANNING COMMISSION
BUSINESS MEETING
June 5, 2018**

MEMBERS PRESENT:

**Amanda Edwards
Jeff Clapper
John Gargan
Peter Paino
Michel Bruder**

STAFF PRESENT:

**Jennifer Barone, Development Engineer
Bridget Susel, Community Development Director
Eric Fink, Asst. Law Director
Sheila Uzl, Transcriptionist**

I. Call To Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

II. Roll Call:

Ms. Edwards, Mr. Gargan, Mr. Clapper, Mr. Paino and Mr. Bruder were present.

III. Reading of the Preamble

The Planning Commission operates in accordance with the provisions of the Kent City Charter, the Kent Zoning Code and Subdivision Regulations, all of which establish the powers and duties of the Commission. Members of the Planning Commission are appointed by Kent City Council and serve without compensation. Certain cases such as Conditional Zoning Certificates, Special Zoning Permits, Overlay District Projects and Zoning Amendment require Public Hearings before the Planning Commission. During the Public Hearing, any person wishing to address their concerns to the Commission will be provided the opportunity. Once the Public Hearing is closed, it shall be the discretion of the Chair whether to allow any additional public comment. Cases such as Site Plan Reviews and Subdivision Projects do not require a Public Hearing. However, the Chair will allow public comment on each case as it is taken on the agenda. In each instance where the Commission receives public comments or conducts a Public Hearing, those persons wishing to address their concerns to the Commission will be required to do so under oath or positive affirmation. The oath or affirmation shall be administered to all who wish to speak at the beginning of the Planning Commission Meeting. Once a decision has been made by the Planning Commission on a case, the Case is closed for the commission, as there is no provision to reopen a case. With the exception of cases falling under the Subdivision Code, any decision of the Planning Commission may be appealed to the City's Board of Zoning Appeals in accordance with the Chapter 1109 of the Zoning Code. Anyone interested in appealing a decision of the Planning Commission is advised to seek private legal counsel.

IV. Administration of Oath

Mr. Fink instructed those members of the audience wishing to be heard on any of the cases presented at this meeting to rise and raise their right hand. Mr. Fink administered the Oath, "Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony that you are about to give this evening is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God? Please say "I do." The participants responded, "I do."

V. Correspondence

AT&T submitted a Public Safety Sheet

VI. Old Business

None

VII. New Business

Ms. Edwards asked for a motion to take the agenda out of order this evening.

MOTION: *Mr. Paino moved in Case PC18-008, 1005 East Main Street, Kent, Ohio Comprehensive Sign Package to hear this case first.*

The motion was seconded by Mr. Clapper.

Motion passed 5 – 0.

Gary O’Nesti 1585 Frederick Blvd., Akron, Ohio stated he had inadvertently missed the Architectural Review Board meeting. He asked to continue until the July 3, 2018 Planning Commission meeting so they can meet with the Architectural Review Board.

MOTION: *Mr. Paino moved in Case PC18-008, 1005 East Main Street, Kent, Ohio Comprehensive Sign Package to continue this case until the July 3, 2018 Planning Commission.*

The motion was seconded by Mr. Clapper.

Motion passed 5 – 0.

**A. PC18-007 NOH6047, Kent State West (AT&T Mobility
Telecommunications Site)
500 VFW Parkway**

Conditional Zoning Certificate and Site Plan Review and Approval to construct a telecommunication site with a 195-foot monopole. The subject property is zoned I: Industrial.

Ms. Edwards asked staff to introduce the project and review the Staff Report.

Ms. Barone stated that AT&T has submitted plans to construct 195-foot high monopole at 500 VFW Parkway which is where the old VFW was located. She said AT&T is leasing a 75'x75' area surrounded by a 6' chain link fence and an access driveway. The access driveway will be off the back of the parking lot. It is a conditional use in the Industrial Zone and must meet the condition in 1171.01(10) which states: "Site locations shall be preferred that offer natural or man-made barriers that would lessen the effect of intrusion into a residential area." There will be no additional parking, and no signage is proposed. The site will include a radio equipment cabinet and a diesel generator for emergency power. The applicant's landscaping plan is to utilize the existing vegetation and plant a row of hedges on the east side as a barrier for the houses across Tallmadge Avenue. She said some of the work is shown outside of the easement area. No variances were required. If the Planning Commission does make a motion, staff suggests that conditions be added to the motion: (1) Technical Plan Review (2) Provide written confirmation from the owner allowing construction activity to occur outside of the easement.

Ms. Edwards asked the applicant to present the project.

Ed Block, 520 South Main Street, Suite 2531, Akron Ohio, said he was from GPD Group and was the engineer for AT&T. He brought a larger version of plans to the meeting. He said AT&T is trying to provide coverage for the area. He said the number of calls reduces the coverage area. Currently there is a hole. There is now a digital technology that requires a better signal. He said they receive information for the targeted area, and they go out to it to confirm the zoning for the area. The location for the monopole is in the right zoning district, and there is a willing property owner who will rent the property to them. It will be placed at the proper elevation. He said there are large pine trees to the south. There will be no guy wires in the 75'x 75' area. There will be a backup diesel generator. The gravel drive will be 20' for fire department ingress/egress. He said there will be an arborvitae hedge. There will be a tree line that will act as a buffer between the site and the residential homes. He super imposed the tower on the existing pictures to give everyone an idea of what it will look like.

Mr. Gargan asked if there would be any noise.

Mr. Block replied there will be a cabinet that has an air conditioner in it, but none from the tower itself. He said the generator cycle makes a sound when it is operating. He said the manufacturer measured 23' from the center of the generator so they are getting a decimal rating with the average being 64.8 and highest 67.2. For comparison, an air conditioner is 60 decimals while 70 is a shower or dishwasher. He said the cycling time can be scheduled and the generator will only come on when necessary.

Mr. Paino asked how the lease would work if the property sold.

Mr. Block replied the lease is with the VFW.

Mr. Fink stated that a lease typically runs with the property and the new property owner would be subject the terms of that lease. He said the VFW could sell that portion of the site for another industrial use.

Mr. Paino asked if the setback would have to go with whatever happens in the future.

Ms. Barone stated the setback is from the property line.

Mr. Bruder asked if the fence would be a 6-foot or an 8-foot fence. He confirmed that the 6-foot fence on the drawings was correct.

Mr. Block replied and said they lowered the fence to 6 feet so they would not have to get a variance.

Mr. Paino asked if there would be a vegetation screen or landscaping.

Ms. Barone referred to Section 1171.05 that stated site locations shall be preferred that offer natural or man-made barriers that would lessen the effect of intrusion into a residential area. There will be a barrier on Tallmadge Avenue.

Mr. Paino asked about the buffer.

Mr. Block stated they can add slats to the fence as well as have plants that can be planted closer.

Mr. Paino confirmed that the fence would be 6 feet.

Mr. Clapper nor Ms. Edwards had any questions.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Sherry Gideon, 619 Tallmadge Road, Kent, Ohio, stated she has been a resident in Kent for 44 years. She read a letter to the Planning Commission:

This is a David and Goliath situation so please bear with me. There are several issues of concern to me so I will try to be succinct.

Since this property is zoned industrial, it appears that the proposed tower may be allowed by conditional use. Currently the actual use of the land is not industrial. All four sides are used primarily residentially except for Haymaker Parkway. By the way, all the homes on Tallmadge, Stow and Longmere were present before the VFW was built.

According to Kent Zoning Code chapter 1117.05 the basis of determination, it is unlikely that (2)(b)(1) and(4)(b)(1) can be met.

I - Property Values

The Appraisal Institute, an international body, has spotlighted cell towers and educated its members that a cell tower should cause a decrease in home values.

August 31, 2008, in a letter to the Los Angeles Board of Superiors, Donna Bohanna, President of Solsitice Realty said "I must disclose to potential buyers where there are any cell towers nearby, I have found in my own experience that there is a very real stigma and cellular facilities near home are perceived as undesirable".

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the 11th Circuit upheld a denial of a cell tower application based upon testimony that the tower could reduce the values of property in close proximity to the proposed tower.

In one 2014 study, 79% of responders said they would never buy or rent within a few city blocks of a cell tower.

Bond Hue Proximate Impact Study in 2004 analyzed 9514 residential home sales in 10 suburbs. The Study reflected the close proximity to a cell tower reduced price by 15% on the average.

In Canada, another study in Red Deer Alberta showed the assessed value of homes were reduced due to the proximity to a cell tower.

Both the assessed and sale values of our homes would be negatively impacted by the siting of a cell tower on this location. Studies I've read range from a low of 2% to a high of 21% negative impact. I sure would consider this detrimental to me and all my neighbors.

II – Safety

We are aware that since the Telecommunications Act of 1996 local governments are not allowed to consider the potential health impacts of the radio frequency radiation from cell towers and antennas when a wireless company files any type of zoning application seeking to install them. However, that doesn't mean that those of us who might be exposed to the non-thermal, non-ionizing radiation don't think of it and/or fear it since there is no scientific agreement as to what a safe level emitted from a cell tower is. Over 100 non-thermal biological effects have been documented in the scientific studies that have been done, DNA damage is one of them. Antennas are added to towers over time, and this one would be no different; only increasing exposure of those living there.

III. Character and Aesthetics of the Neighborhood

Over the past decade, Kent has worked quite diligently to rebuild the downtown area and upgrade the City. We now welcome visitors to Kent frequently with activities,

parades and festivals, etc. Haymaker Parkway is the main western entrance to the City. I'm proud to say that years ago I helped raise money for landscaping of the Parkway. I just cannot envision the construction such an eyesore at our western gateway to the City. It would be only 0.7 miles from the center of town.

Many years ago, when Pricilla Blanchard was City Manager a similar proposal for a cell tower on the VFW property was before this Commission. After several meetings a decision was made to site the tower on an alternative site, now at Mogadore and Cherry Streets. We noted that in Hudson for instance no proposal was made so close to downtown, in fact, the cell tower site in Hudson is next to Rt. 480. If this location for a cell tower at the VFW was not deemed appropriate back then due to the impact on the City, why would it be approved as appropriate now?

Tallmadge Avenue is a quiet rather pastoral setting currently. There aren't even sidewalks on the street. The site in question is a big grassy area with three one story buildings which are not industrial in nature or use. Across the street on Tallmadge Avenue there are several homes. The addition of a cell tower would not be harmonious in appearance with the existing area what so ever, and the existing character and aesthetics of the general vicinity would be forever changed. I would ask that members of the Commission ride, walk or bike down Tallmadge and see the area in question before making any permanent decision, and drive into town from the west on Haymaker Parkway and look over to your right. Wouldn't a huge cell tower mar the view negatively as you drove into Kent from that direction? Would this not be the definition of contrary to the public interest? I believe the 150- day limit is not looming in the near future so a decision does not have to be made just now.

IV – Pertinent Information

According to Antennasearch.com, within a 4- mile radius of Kent, there are already 46 towers and 149 antennas. Many are in and around Kent already. For instance, there is a cell tower, much like that proposed, on Middlebury Road about a mile from the proposed site. AT&T is rated to have the best coverage locally compared to other carriers. I've learned that a cell phone can pick up a tower from as little as 22 miles to as much as 45 miles. So, I ask, with the 149 antennas within a 4-mile radius, realizing that there are other carriers, is this tower really necessary?

Has AT&T proved there is a significant gap in service coverage?

Have alternative locations with less visual and aesthetic impacts on the community been pursued?

Has AT&T shown there is a lack of available and technologically feasible alternative sites?

Has AT&T met the least intrusive means standard?

Has AT&T pursued the potential for colocation with existing facilities since we have so many close?

How many northern Ohio cities has AT&T asked to site a huge cell tower within a half mile of the center town or is Kent alone in that regard?

In Summary

I believe the information that has been presented that a cell tower at the VFW property would: decrease property values for existing residents thus being detrimental, not be in any way harmonious and appropriate in appearance with the existing character of the general vicinity and change the aesthetics of the western entrance to Kent in a big and negative way thus being contrary to the public interest.

Lastly, would anyone here want to look out their front window or door to see a looming cell tower? I think not. I don't even think those working for AT&T would volunteer to do so.

Thank you.

Ms. Gideon stated the screening around the fenced area is not the issue. It is the tower.

Ms. Edwards reminded those speaking from the public they are limited to three minutes.

Eric Marchek, 700 VFW, Kent Ohio, asked if the tower was being built by AT&T or by a developer that will lease the space to AT&T. He said Arborvitae will only act as a barrier for a building. Everyone will share the tower.

Tara Weckerly, 552 Tallmadge Avenue, Kent, Ohio said the tall pines are not going to hide the pole. She was concerned of the possibility of contracting cancer caused by the waves. There are not enough studies to determine that and that it is a possible risk for cancer. She said her daughter is the fifth generation to live in the house and she does not want her daughter to be the study.

James Parsons, 611 Tallmadge Avenue, Kent, Ohio stated he just moved into the house. He said there have not been enough health risk research or studies done. He was concerned that his children might be born with health issues. He said the roads are so small that there are no sidewalks. He was concerned about property values. He said the chain link fence looks disgusting. These are big concerns that have not been entirely addressed. He would like to have some answers to the health risks and whether his property value will go down.

Lester Lamp, 553 Tallmadge Avenue, Kent, Ohio, said he looks out his window and sees the tower. He said he lived in another home where another tower was located and it disrupted his TV reception.

Sally Volpe, 600 Talmadge, Kent, Ohio, stated she has been living on Tallmadge Avenue for over 41 years. She has a lot of fear if the tower goes in there. She said they have worked hard on the property. She said they have a lot of flowers and have a beautiful yard. They have worked very hard to have this and are concerned the property values will go down. She is concerned about the health issues.

Tony Montoni, 121 Short Street, Kent, Ohio, stated they have lived on Tallmadge for 60 years. He said Sherry gave a very good presentation. He said his main concerns are the health issues and the property resale. He said they have taken great care to maintain the kind of atmosphere on Tallmadge Avenue. It is neighborly and people still go out in the evening. It is a little bit of country in the City. He did not want to see that area destroyed by the installation of a 90-foot tower. He said it was not understood why the tower could not be moved to the RB&W property. He said the residents deserve the right to have their life style maintained. He suggested that the Zoning Department should look at the peaceful area. He said he has spoken to quite a few realtors and they have responded that this will without a doubt affect resales.

There were no other comments from the public.

Ms. Edwards said they would move forward to questions from the Planning Commission or the applicant regarding public comments. She asked Mr. Block to respond to the question as to whether the tower was going to be built AT&T or by a developer and what that would mean in terms of long term.

Mr. Block stated that AT& has a lease with the property owner. He said sites are owned by another company for maintenance. He said the third company can allow for other cellular companies to use the tower which ensures for more longevity in case AT&T goes out of business. The lease states that the tower and ground units must be removed if there is no carrier. AT&T will be there if operated by someone else.

It was asked how many mono-towers existed in the area.

Ms. Susel replied there is one on Middlebury and the one on Mogadore and Cherry.

Mr. Clapper asked what the general range would be. He asked why the tower had to be so close.

Mr. Block replied when looking for a site, they had to take the height into factor, the building mount and other factors. He said high business use will require two close together. He said the data will go further usually in less dense areas.

Mr. Paino asked how many are in the City of Kent.

Ms. Barone replied two are known.

Ms. Susel said there are micro ones also.

Mr. Bruder asked if AT&T had pursued being on other towers also.

Mr. Block replied yes. They need 195 feet though.

Mr. Paino asked if his phone will work if he was in the yellow area.

Mr. Block replied his phone will work but data transfer will not.

John Kovitch, from AT&T located at 700 Bell Street, Akron, Ohio, stated they have a team that looks at three sectors that have to be considered such as can each sector hold so much traffic use, trends, and projected forecasts down the road. He said that is part of the reason this location was selected. This location was selected because the water tank, the sector that points west, is reaching its maximum compacity. There might be other towers in the area but there is nothing in between the two sites where AT&T is located that would accommodate the best data for the high demand in that sector. He said all metal structures and buildings degrade the signal. He said they use the tools they have. He said every carrier now is finding it necessary to beef up. He said hot spots and streaming are the trend. He said homes are going to be connected, and all these phones need access to the tower when the use is forecasted. This is what is driving this particular tower. He referred to the site and explained why they want to install the tower at this location. He said other areas will reach capacity.

Mr. Bruder asked why it could not be at street level.

Mr. Kovitch replied vegetation and the building had to be considered. There are 41 different classes in a propagation tool that is used as predictive.

Mr. Bruder asked if a determination was made on whether it was stronger.

Mr. Kovitch replied based on the data, it is predictive.

Mr. Bruder asked if it was directional or spherical.

Mr. Kovitch replied it would be directional. There would be less underneath due to the angle. The strength is based on terrain and clutter. Based on the direction, clutter and terrain it will have a $1 - 1/12$ unit radius.

Mr. Bruder asked if they knew the radius of the circles shown.

Mr. Kovitch replied when you are in the rural area, because of less things to get in the way of the signal, and the towers are higher, so the signal could go as far as 5 – 8 miles. As an area gets more populated, the towers are shorter and the signal goes shorter distances.

Mr. Bruder stated that essentially the data sheets represent population density and the demand.

Mr. Kovitch replied it wasn't necessarily based on population but rather different systems that would be required.

Mr. Bruder asked if this covered the downtown density and the university density.

Mr. Kavitch replied the university.

Mr. Bruder asked how the signal strength was measured. He asked if there was a drawing that shows the distance.

Mr. Kovitch replied yes, it is shown on the drawing.

Mr. Block clarified that this was just not for today but is a 20 -year plan for the future.

Mr. Paino asked if this will have an impact on the TVs in the area.

Mr. Kovitch replied he has been doing this for over 22 years and was not aware in that time that it impacts TVs or radios.

Mr. Paino asked what the future will be and if more will be coming in; either AT&T or some other company.

Mr. Kovitch replied it is transitioning into small cell. Most of the carriers are applying this into downtown Cleveland. He said they have done only six (6) capacity sites in northern Ohio in 20 years. There can be 4 – 5 companies on one tower. A pole is designed for at least three companies. He said the antennas seen are for other companies such Verizon.

Mr. Paino asked what the other options would be.

Mr. Block replied towers, buildings and tall structures.

Additional discussion on the use of other structures and the signal strength. There is a water tower on Fairchild. Signal strength was also discussed.

Ms. Susel said that water tower on Fairchild is on the north side and near a house located at 527. It was just repainted which was a costly job.

Mr. Clapper asked if the downtown would not be changed now or in the future.

Mr. Bloke replied yes, this site was picked because the capacity is needed on this site.

Mr. Bruder asked if there was a list of other potential sites.

Mr. Block said they had a ¼ - 1- mile search ring with the right zoning and the correct elevation. All three were all close and in the Industrial District.

Ms. Edwards asked if the requirement for a conditional use is in Section 1171.01(10). She asked if that was the only one that had to be followed or if 1171.05 also had to be followed.

Ms. Barone replied that is a conditional use requirement plus 1171.01(10) had to be considered also.

Ms. Edwards asked Mr. Fink to discuss the sections of the code that had to be considered.

Mr. Fink recommended that the Planning Commission base its decision on 1171.01(10) and they should go to Section 1107.05(a) 1 – 6 and read through the circumstances. He said Section 1171.05 (b)(1) and (b)(2) do not apply in this situation. He suggested that the Planning Commission check each condition.

Ms. Susel agreed with Mr. Fink that the Planning Commission should look at section 1 through 6.

Mr. Paino discussed and reviewed each condition. He read Section 1107.05(a): “The applicant shall be required to establish by clear and convincing evidence that the general standards of this Zoning Ordinance, this Chapter and the specific standards pertinent to each proposed use shall be met throughout the period of the proposed use. The Planning Commission shall determine compliance or non-compliance and shall insure that the general standards, the specific standards and other terms of this Ordinance pertinent to the proposed use shall be satisfied by the completion and operation of the proposed development. The general standards that the Planning Commission shall review be the facts and circumstances for each proposed use in terms of the following standards. Shall find that such use of proposed location will: (1) Shall be harmonious with and in accordance with the general objectives or with any specific objective of the Land Use and Thoroughfare Plan (Comprehensive Development Plan) of current adoption.” He said the current plan is the Bicentennial Plan.

Mr. Fink stated the Planning Commission can ask for more time to analyze each individual factor.

Ms. Susel stated the Planning Commission can ask for special reports. She said copies of the Bicentennial Plan has been provided to the commissioners.

Mr. Paino said the commissioners obviously have to reference that document. He continued to read 1107.05(a): (2) Shall be designed, constructed, operated and maintained so as to be harmonious and appropriate in appearance with the existing or intended character of the general vicinity and that such use shall not change the essential character

of the same area. He said it was not harmonious with adjacent residential area. It is in an Industrial Zone.

Mr. Fink stated the Kent City code does not define that, but it is up to the commissioners to determine if it is in the vicinity.

Mr. Paino continued to read 1107.05(a): (3) Shall not be hazardous or disturbing to existing or future neighboring uses. He said it is debatable if it was hazardous or disturbing.

Mr. Paino continued to read 1107.05(a): (4) Shall not be detrimental to property in the immediate vicinity or to the community as a whole. A decrease in property value would be detrimental.

Mr. Fink stated that the Planning Commission has to apply the laws to the facts.

Mr. Paino continued to read 1107.05(a): (5) Shall be served adequately by essential public facilities and services such as highways, streets, police and fire protection, drainage structures; or that the persons or agencies responsible for the establishment of such use shall be able to provide adequately any such service including refuse disposal. He said it seems to meet this requirement.

Mr. Paino continued to read 1107.05(a): (6) Shall have vehicular approaches to the property which shall be so designed as not to create an interference with traffic on surrounding public streets or roads. He said this requirement is met.

There was additional discussion among the commissioners.

Mr. Clapper stated the Planning Commissioners should serve the citizens.

Ms. Edwards and Mr. Paino said they have to go by the law and this is a conditional use.

Mr. Fink stated the commissioners have to determine how the general vicinity is being affected. They also have to decide that there is clear and convincing evidence.

Mr. Bruder asked if the case could be continued if the Planning Commission requested additional studies. He asked if those studies had to be defined today or was it something the Planning Commission could ask Staff for information referencing to the application.

Mr. Fink replied the Planning Commission has 60 days to act if the Planning Commission requests a continuance. The commissioners can ask for information at any time. If the applicant requests the continuance, there is a different time frame. Staff prefers that the commission gives them specific information on what they want.

Ms. Susel stated that Section 1107.04 it states that if the Planning Commission feels there is a need for additional information, it may instruct the applicant or the administration to conduct additional studies.

Mr. Fink stated the Planning Commission does not have to give a reason to ask to continue the case.

Mr. Bruder stated that the towers and antennae in the City of Kent should be identified. He said other sites considered should be discussed. These factors need to be considered to reach an alternate solution.

Mr. Paino stated it would be difficult to make a decision at this meeting. He needed more time to look at the Bicentennial Plan that is mentioned in 1107.05(a)(1). It might change the character of the existing area as discussed in Section 1107.05(a)(2). Referring to 1107.05(a)(3), he said whether it is hazardous or not cannot be taken into consideration but it could be disturbing. Referring to Section 1107.05(a)(4), he questioned whether it was detrimental to the surrounding area. He felt he needed more evidence before he could make a decision.

Mr. Block asked to table this case until the July 17, 2018 Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Fink stated there was no need for a motion.

Ms. Susel asked for additional information for the Planning Commission from the applicant. She asked that the applicant identify antennae and poles. There is already a map and asked that the applicant identify the height. She asked the commission if they want to identify the co-location antennae and poles.

Mr. Block stated that they can provide smaller scale information related to the large towers and alternate site. He said the tower will be constructed in 2019.

Ms. Susel stated she has information on the small cell wireless and she will send that information to the commissioners.

Ms. Edwards confirmed that no motion is needed and the case will be continued until the July 17, 2018 Planning Commission.

In response to a question from a member of the public, Ms. Susel stated that Ms. Edwards can reopen Public Comment at the July 17, 2018 meeting but only comments from the new information will be accepted.

A five- minute break was taken.

VIII. Minutes *April 3, 2018*

MOTION: *Mr. Paino moved to approve the April 3, 2018 minutes as submitted.*

The motion was seconded by Mr. Gargan.

The motion passed 5 – 0.

IX. Other Business

Presentation by Kent State University on current and proposed construction projects.

Mr. Bruder stated that Kent State University comes to a Planning Commission meeting to give the commissioners an update on the projects Kent State University is planning and proceeded to give an overhead slide presentation.

The Facilities Master Plan was approved and adopted by the Kent State University Board of Trustees back in March. The university is actually getting started on some of the more detailed planning and execution of construction over the next three years. It is a ten-year plan and is aspirational so they could put a lot of things on it that the university will not necessarily be able to afford. It has a \$1.2 billion price tag on it and Kent State University is focused on Phase I that includes \$220 million construction on campus for the first three years. There is a lot of academic activity but there is also room for some public/private partnerships. Questions come up why now?

The Master Plan is separate from the Fund-Raising Plan. There are five things Kent State University wants to develop on campus including creating a signature gateway, extend iconic front campus, elevate innovation throughout campus, enhance a dynamic campus life and expand a connection to the City of Kent. He referred to the proposed Master Plan which shows the campus as well as streets in the City of Kent. The light blue buildings are marked for renovation, darker yellow buildings are collaboration for housing and the light tan color are existing buildings.

There are 130 buildings on campus with 6,000,000 square feet on 900 acres. This is one of the university's transformational strategies. He said currently Terrace aligns with Luther at Main Street and they are proposing closing a portion of Terrace and reconnecting it to Midway Drive and then have a signature gateway there. As part of that they are working on the College of Business and there are about 750 surface parking spaces in that area that go all the way down to Midway and all the way to the Commons. He said they are considering taking all that surface parking out and consolidating it in a deck that will be on the east side of Midway.

The university is going to invest in White Hall and make some renovations both in the infrastructure and on the exterior that is lacking in architectural appeal. A building in one

area will be taken down to make room for a new building in that location. The biggest concern will be maintaining as many of the mature trees they can.

There are 1100 surface spaces on Summit Street and a parking deck across from the student green with 800 – 900 spaces and they will be leaving some surface spaces. White Hall offers an outdoor amphitheater and additional landscaping.

The university wants to get a better connection from downtown Kent to Terrace Drive to arrive at the College of Business. The university has been working with design innovation.

Mr. Bruder continued to discuss the renovation or replacement of additional buildings and parking. The student center will be updated. An addition to the rec center is being considered because it is such a busy place. The Health Center needs some work. There has been a conversation with a private partnership where they would develop Greek housing on Kent State University on Campus Center Drive and connect to private fraternities on Fraternity Circle. The university wants to build 4 - 6 houses with 15 – 30 students. The Commons and Taylor Hall shown on a slide is not the final design but just gives a sense of what they will look like. The university is expanding its connection to the City of Kent, and the university has some very specific projects involved in this.

The big focus is on two areas. One is the Lincoln Road neighborhood, the rectangle between the esplanade, Main Street, Lincoln and Willow. The university is considering a public/private mixed use in that area. This would be a three- story building with the first floor for restaurant and retail. The second and third floor will be instruction space including studio space, classrooms, and faculty offices. This intent is to support architecture and fashion programs. There are some pressing issues in this area so a parking deck will be added along College and the intent is to be a part of a partnership with the City of Kent and PARTA. The university needs the parking during the day and City of Kent needs parking for special events. This parking deck could be available for the general population.

The university is also looking to partner with the City of Kent on the former site of family housing on Allerton. The buildings have been torn down. There is 40 acres there and the university is considering an inter-generational village where there would single homes, some market family apartments and possible living area. There are opportunities to provide support and research to this area.

The university wants Captain Brady's Block which includes Star Bucks as part of the redevelopment within the three -story structure and some parking area to support the area.

The City of Kent Engineer is working on State Route 261 which might include a hike and bike trail. The City of Kent is also evaluating traffic improvements on East Main Street.

The Summit Road projection was funded with 80% of federal and the City of Kent and Kent State University each matched the remaining balance.

Slides were shown on how the projects are broken down into phases: 1) 2018 – 2021 2) 2021- 2023 3) 2024 – 2027 and 4) Independent Phase. The projects shown indicate what phase it is in. There is a strong focus along Main Street.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Kim Sebaly, 132 Luther Avenue, Kent, Ohio, stated he has lived in the area for 46 years. He said the citizens are really appreciative of Jim Bowling's effort to involve the citizens and the university to figure out things. He said a transformation of Kent State University is a transformation of the City of Kent. He said the concept passed by the Board of Trustees in March became a plan. He said the parking deck was a major issue of discussion. He said the signature gateway will change things because there is already congestion at Midway. Putting a parking deck there rather than where it was originally planned raised some issues such as a corner of it will be in the way of the road so it will be torn down and moved about 100 feet. He said Jim Bowling and others toured the area to try to understand what was going to be gone as far as the trees as a result of the parking deck. He recommended that people go there to see some of the trees in the City and on campus. He said surveyor stakes were already going in after a discussion that was held. He said the question was whether a meeting could be held with groups such as garden groups that know the area. It is important to try to understand why the location was selected. The main point is if civil action to save the trees wanted to be prevented, a traffic impact study needs to be done. He said he hopes there can be some further dialog about it.

Ms. Edwards stated that this is just an informational presentation.

Mr. Clapper asked where the sidewalk would be located.

Mr. Bruder replied they will be moving them away from the street.

Ms. Barone stated that the next Planning Commission meeting is July 3, 2018

X. Adjournment

Motion: *Mr. Paino moved to adjourn.*
 The motion was seconded by Mr. Clapper

Vote: *The motion carried 5 – 0.*

Meeting adjourned at 9:50 p.m.