

**Land Development Committee Minutes**  
**October 24, 2013**

Attendees: Ed Hattenbach (Committee Member), Natalie Wolf (Committee Member), Scot Lahrmer, Bill Doering, J.K. Byar, Peg Conway, Kevin Frank, Steve Rasfeld, Wes Brown and Tom Muething (Committee Chair)

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. The minutes from the meeting of April 2, 2013 were reviewed and approved.

The purpose of the meeting was to background on the proposed amendment to the zoning code relating to panhandle lots. This proposed amendment was sent by the Planning Commission to Council with a recommendation for adoption. There was a first reading of the proposal at the October Council meeting and a public hearing has been scheduled for November 11. This committee was limited to background information because it would be inappropriate to discuss anything further prior to the public hearing.

Steve Rasfeld reviewed with the Committee a map of Amberley explaining how he had determined the maximum number of lots impacted by the proposal. The attached memo presents this information.

Kevin Frank explained how the proposal was developed focusing on the proposed language. He explained that codes in other municipalities were reviewed and this was the primary basis for the proposal. He distributed the codes for Madeira, Montgomery, Silverton, Monroe, Terrace Park, Amelia, Cheviot and Cincinnati.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Tom Muething

## Panhandle Subdivision Potential within Amberley Village

June 2013

*Modified 10 2013*

This cursory summary outlines the real estate lots within the Village that are large enough to qualify to be subdivided into multiple lots. The criterion for this list was based solely on gross area of the subject lot. There was no attempt to determine the viability of such a split or if the resulting lots would meet the zoning code in respect to lot dimensions other than potential area. Additional factors for the viability of the subdivision of a given lot might include factors such as the location of the existing house, whether or not that structure would need to be removed in order to create the additional lot(s) or if the structure remained would it comply with current setbacks on the proposed lot, topography, economic factors etc.. A couple of these highlighted lots are a product of multiple parcels contiguous under the same ownership and appear as one lot but might actually be two or more recorded parcels meaning they may already be ‘subdivided’ being ‘lots of record’. An example of this is the lot that was recently sold along East Galbraith Road as a current home site and adjacent panhandle lot at 3460 East Galbraith Road. The total area of the lot(s) (combined) is 2.224 acres; the existing house sits on 1.163 acres while the back lot is comprised of 1.061 acres.

The highlighted map includes;

Yellow for lots of 2.5 acres and more, approximately 47 sites, *with the modified 150% rule, 2.64 acres would be required in Residence A as a minimum [1 acre front lot plus 1.5 acre rear lot plus the area require to form the panhandle (20' x 290' depth) estimated at 0.14 acres (the access strip would not be a part of the area calculation for either lot)] therefore, 47 sites minus 8 that are too small and another that was subdivided without the need for a panhandle (was 2.5 parcels) into two compliant lots leaves 38 remaining possibilities based upon available area only.*

Pink for lots of 2.0 to 2.49 acres, approximately 38 sites, *only one of these lots are in Residence B and one is existing as two parcels one of which is a panhandle recorded as a lot at 3460 Galbraith therefore, the remaining 36 would no longer qualify as being large enough to support a one acre front lot, an acre and a half rear lot plus the estimated 0.14 acre area (totaling 2.64 acres) needed for the access strip in Residence A zone.*

Blue delineates the Residence ‘B’ zone areas in the Village and,

Green indicates lots in Residence ‘B’ equal to or greater than 1 acre, approximately five sites *of these sites only one lot would support a .5 acre front lot, a .75 acre rear lot plus the area required for the access strip equating to 1.25 plus acres.*

Non-residential Village-owned properties were not highlighted (Amberley Green utilized currently as a park, the North Site and the Village Hall site are currently utilized as municipal operations/functions) nor was any of French Park considered as a viable site for subdivision.

The industrial sites (in both Industrial 'A' and 'B' zones) were highlighted as they could possibly be utilized in a different manner as a result of subdivision. Industrial 'A' includes the old Gibson site and the P&G site, Industrial 'A' sites are to be 20 acres minimum. Of these two sites, only the old Gibson site is large enough to produce multiple sites if subdivided, P&G is currently 23.9 acres, only slightly larger than the current minimum area required.

Industrial 'B' sites; Pepsi, Topicz, Ohio Pulp Mill and E-Z Pack, require a minimum of two acres of land area to meet the current code. Of these sites, only the Pepsi and Topicz sites are large enough to produce more than one other site if subdivided but Pepsi occupies nearly the entire site as does Topicz that just invested heavily in a large expansion. It seems neither site is likely to subdivide any time in the near future as long as the current businesses continue to thrive.