

MINUTES OF THE STARK COUNTY LAND REUTILIZATION CORPORATION
September 21, 2020

The Stark County Land Reutilization Corporation met for their regular meeting on Monday, September 21, 2020 at 9:00 a.m. in the Stark County Regional Planning Commission Conference Room. The option to participate via teleconference was made available.

Board Members Present

Alex Zumbar
Janet Creighton
Lem Green
Bill Smith
John Arnold

1. CALL TO ORDER BY SCLRC CHAIRMAN, Alex Zumbar

2. ROLL CALL – Board Members Present

Roll call found the following Board members in attendance: Alex Zumbar, Janet Creighton, Bill Smith and John Arnold. (Lem Green arrived later)

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF AUGUST 17, 2020 MEETING

Zumbar moved and Arnold seconded to approve the minutes of August 17, 2020 meeting. Roll call vote: Zumbar -yes, Creighton - yes, Green – absent, Smith – yes, Arnold – yes. Motion carried.

4. PUBLIC SPEAKS – No public speaks

5. TREASURER/FISCAL REPORT

Heather Cunningham reviewed the Treasurer’s Report for the month of August. Smith moved and Creighton seconded to approve the Treasurer’s Report for August. Roll call vote: Zumbar -yes, Creighton - yes, Green – absent, Smith – yes, Arnold – yes. Motion carried.

6. SIDE LOT/VACANT LOT PROGRAM REPORT

Sarah Peters provided the Side Lot Program Update:

Total Applications Submitted: 2,043

(8 applications were received since August '20 update)

Cities – 1,709

Canton: 1,349, Massillon: 133, Alliance: 227

Other Communities – 334

Bethlehem Twp – 29, Brewster – 9, Canal Fulton – 1, Canton Twp – 61, East Canton – 7, East Sparta – 2, Hartville – 3, Jackson Twp – 5, Lake Twp – 6, Lawrence Twp – 11, Lexington Twp – 40, Limaville – 2, Louisville – 2, Marlboro Twp. – 1, Meyer’s Lake – 1, Minerva – 3, Nimishillen – 6,

North Canton – 1, Osnaburg Twp – 15, Paris Twp – 3, Perry Twp – 14, Pike Twp – 20, Plain Twp – 34, Sandy Twp – 40, Sugarcreek Twp – 6, Tuscarawas Twp – 2, Washington Twp – 5, Waynesburg – 4, Wilmot -1

-
- Total Number of Applications under Preliminary Review: 4
 - Total Number of Applications Denied: 870
 - Number of Canceled Applications/Fee Refunded: 70
 - Total Number Pending Approval by Community: 30
 - **Total Number of Approved Applications: 1069**
-
- Total Number of Approved Applications Pending Deposit Receipt / NIP Early Lien Release Approval / Request for Foreclosure / Completed Foreclosure Proceeding: 114
 - Total Number Being Prepared for Transfer: 8
 - **Total Number Transferred to Date: 947**

Vacant Lot Program Update:

Total Applications Submitted: 223

(8 Application received since Aug '20 update)

Cities – 184; Canton: 164, Alliance: 13, Massillon: 7

Other Communities – 39

Bethlehem Twp - 15, Canton Twp – 7, Hartville – 1, Jackson Twp – 2, Lake – 1, Lexington Twp – 2, Perry – 1, Sandy – 5, Sugarcreek Twp – 1, Washington Twp – 4

-
- Total Number of Applications under Preliminary Review: 7
 - Total Number of Applications Denied: 168
 - Number of Canceled Applications/Fee Refunded: 7
 - Total Number Pending Approval by Community: 0
 - **Total Number of Approved Applications: 41**
-
- Total Number of Approved Applications Pending Executed MOU/ Completion of Foreclosure Proceeding: 2
 - Total Number Being Prepared for Transfer: 0
 - Total Number Transferred to Date: 39

Arnold moved and Creighton seconded to approve the Side Lot/Vacant Lot report as presented. Roll call vote: Zumbar -yes, Creighton - yes, Green – absent, Smith – yes, Arnold – yes. Motion carried.

7. **NEW BUSINESS**

- a. Targeted Acquisition Assistance Program Requests
 - City of Massillon – Parcel #603322 – 514 Lincoln Way East; #608012 – 112 Erie Street S.; #607508 – 120 Erie Street S.; #607509 – 130 Erie Street S.

- City of Alliance – Parcel #110314 – 407 Liberty Ave. N.

(Member Green arrived). Creighton moved and Arnold seconded to approve the TAAP requests from the cities of Massillon and Alliance. Roll call vote: Zumbar -yes, Creighton - yes, Green – yes, Smith – yes, Arnold – yes. Motion carried.

b. Non-Allocated NIP Funds

Peters informed the Board that OHFA reached out to Stark County and other land banks in Ohio that have a current agreement for non-allocated funds to ask that if they were given additional money, would they have available properties that could be demolished by December. The Land Bank had previously received \$545,000 from that pot of non-allocated money to finish up demolitions. Staff reached out to the City of Canton, because they have been actively requesting 50/50 demos from the Land Bank, to see if they had any interest or capabilities of doing something within that tight timeframe. If these funds were given to SCLRC, the stipulation would be to have them torn down by December, and submitted for reimbursement. Staff spoke with JR Rinaldi, City of Canton, and the city was all on board. There are about eight parcels that will be pursued. OHFA has given the Land Bank \$100,000, allocating up to \$12,500 per parcel for these demolitions.

8. Old Business

a. DAP Application/Nimishillen Township– parcel #33-08322 – 9033 Columbus Rd.

Peters stated the township had rebid this project and resubmitted a new application with all the required documentation. The township estimated the hard costs for the project to be \$26,650 and are requesting \$13,325. Don Keefe, Nimishillen Township Trustee, commented that this building was in very bad shape, and they had two other buildings they would like to take down in the future. The owners were looking to get a Dollar General to replace the dilapidated building. He indicated that any help would be appreciated as they try to get that area cleaned up.

Creighton moved and Smith seconded to approve the request from Nimishillen Township. Roll call vote: Zumbar -yes, Creighton - yes, Green – yes, Smith – yes, Arnold – yes. Motion carried.

b. Side Lot/Vacant Lot Program Discussion

Thorley stated at last month's Land Bank meeting, the Board asked that a committee be formed to review the side lot policy. Before that committee met, Peters and himself met with Jason Frost and Jon Oates at the Auditor's office to find out if there were other camp clubs similar to Springwood Lake Camp Club. Thorley referenced an email from Jason Frost that stated Springwood Lake Camp Club was the only campground in the system that allows for private ownership of lots. In reviewing 49 manufactured home parks, only one had privately owned lots in their community. So out of all the clubs and manufactured home parks within Stark County, there's only two that allow for private ownership of the lot, and Springwood was the biggest with 1,078 camper lots.

Following the committee meeting to discuss the side lot policy, a draft copy of the policy was produced for the Board's review showing the proposed revisions. Thorley restated what the Board had expressed in a prior meeting regarding RPC's decision to stop processing the side lot applications with the camp club. The revisions made in the introductory paragraph to the side lot policy addresses that

point, making it clear that any override of this policy can only be done by the Board of Directors. It was Thorley's understanding that the Board wished staff to complete those applications already submitted, which included 13 on hold and 5 in the prosecutor's hands. He stated that it was RPC's recommendation that additional side lot applications not be accepted, and he would ask the Board for a motion and a vote as it relates to Springwood Lake Camp Club going forward. If the Board decides to adopt the revisions to the side lot policy first, then that motion could come after that. Creighton asked Thorley to confirm that the five applications in process and the 13 remaining applications would still be done. Thorley stated that was correct.

Thorley reviewed the proposed revisions to the policy. Some of the revisions were simple housekeeping items, but the major changes would be the priorities established by the Board of Directors, the 15,000 square feet cut off for side lots, and then leaving the price for a side lot the same at \$100.

Zumbar asked if the board adopts these changes to the side lot policy, would this impede the Springwood Lake Campground in their objective. Thorley stated the policy changes do not affect Springwood Lake, but if the Board adopts these policy changes, then we will ask the Board to pass a separate motion for that specific situation. It is our recommendation that it does not fit the mission of the Land Bank to go after camp club lots.

Zumbar asked the Board if they were comfortable with these recommended policy changes to the side lot program. Arnold also believed that what's going on at Springwood Lake really doesn't meet the goal of what the Land Bank is about, and the Land Bank is not here to support camp clubs. But this puts the onus back on the Board, so it is the Board's decision whether it qualifies or doesn't qualify. Smith stated so in Springwood someone would get a lot using the vacant lot program and then grab the vacant lots adjacent to them using the side lot program. Thorley stated once they grabbed one as a vacant lot, they could go for the contiguous properties around it. Smith asked if someone has a lot with their camper and they want to get the vacant lots beside them, could they apply for a side lot legitimately. They are not doing it for an investment; they're not doing it to flip it, but they are doing it for extra space. Thorley stated under the current policy, yes. He was asking the Board, based upon RPC's recommendation and the discussions the board has had at previous meetings, to pass a resolution saying we will not pursue future side lot applications for Springwood Campground.

Deana Stafford, Treasurer's office, stated the scenario that has just been described actually has happened in the City of Canton where someone starts off by purchasing a vacant lot and then gets adjacent side lots. So, it's just not exclusive to Springwood, because that modification to the policy will prevent somebody in the City of Canton from being able to do it. Smith stated but they could still go after a side lot, because they own the property beside them. Stafford stated but not if the Board specifically denies any applications from Springwood. Green stated he didn't believe that owning the lot is sufficient under any policy; isn't there a requirement that they own *and* occupy. Zumbar stated if a landlord owns the apartment building, and they want to acquire the side lot next to them, they don't get the preference. Peters stated a landlord qualifies as a side lot applicant, but if there were multiple applicants for one lot, the landlord does not get preference or priority. Green stated but in that event, the applicant would have to pay the assessed value, not the \$100. Peters stated no, if they are the titled owner and are side lot qualified, it's \$100. If the applicant was the renter, and they didn't own the home, they wouldn't qualify, but they could apply through the vacant lot program. Arnold stated we did discuss that, and to your point, it shouldn't necessarily cost a landlord more money if he's going to clean it up and take care of it. That's the essence of the program. Smith asked if someone at Springwood

Lake can't go through this program, how would they go about acquiring it. Zubar stated they would go through Interested Purchaser or seek advice from the Treasurer and Prosecutor's office on foreclosing on it. Peters stated for example, if someone is interested in getting a lot beside their camper's lot that is vacant and tax delinquent, they could go through either the Treasurer's Interested Purchaser program or the Land Bank's side lot or vacant lot program to get it. Some have gone through the vacant lot program and then went for the other lots beside that. If the Board does not approve of this investment-like strategy of using the vacant lot program then the Board may want to consider not allowing Springwood Campground lots to be obtained through the vacant lot program, and only allowing lots to be acquired through the side lot program.

Zubar asked if the Board could enter into an agreement or MOU with Springwood Campground since they are the only campground in the system that have lots available for private ownership. This agreement would treat the acquisition of the lots as fairly as possible but also would not prohibit someone from acquiring one, but make it understood that it will only apply to this particular area. Thorley stated that is well within the purview of the board to instruct him to do that. But he asked clarification on the parameters of that agreement and if any and all costs would be borne by the applicant. Zubar thought that would be fair. Thorley stated he would have a meeting with them just exploring it and then get back to the Board the next meeting in October.

Zubar believed the proposed changes to the side lot policy were very simple changes, he would be in favor of moving forward and adopting this today if the board is so inclined. Green moved and Arnold seconded to adopt the proposed changes to the Side Lot Disposition Program. Roll call vote: Zubar -yes, Creighton - yes, Green – yes, Smith – yes, Arnold – yes. Motion carried.

Thorley asked if it was the Board's pleasure to adopt a motion as it relates to Springwood Lake at this moment, subject to change based upon any conversations and agreement that he can work out with Springwood Camp Club. Green moved and Zubar seconded the motion. Creighton stated that she was not ready to vote on that and would vote no today. Arnold stated Thorley could meet and see how that conversation comes out. Thorley asked if tomorrow somebody submits an application for the Springwood Campgrounds, is it our higher priority that we're not going to deal with those applications at this time. Arnold stated according to the policy that was just approved, it would be the Board's decision whether an application would qualify for the program. Green and Zubar withdrew their motions.

c. Authorization for SCLRC to apply for U.S. EPA Brownfield Assessment Funding

Nau stated that at the last work session, Rachel Forchione gave a presentation on the US EPA Brownfield assessment grant. Nau asked for the Board's approval to submit a brownfield assessment grant for the Land Bank. They would be looking at a community-wide grant for \$300,000. The RPC in 2014 received a similar grant which is what was used to fund the assessment of the two Starfire gas stations, work done on the Doctor's Hospital and Republic Storage, Bishop's Gate and also Lehman's School. Zubar moved and Creighton seconded to approve the authorization to submit the grant application. Creighton asked if these were shovel-ready projects. Nau stated they will be doing phase 1 and phase 2 assessments to determine the problems, but they have not yet identified the specific addresses. Zubar stated he knew there is a gas station in East Sparta that is perhaps something to look at. Roll call vote: Zubar -yes, Creighton - yes, Green – yes, Smith – yes, Arnold – yes. Motion carried.

9. Next Meeting – October 19th - 9:00 a.m. - The meeting was adjourned at 9:36 a.m.