



Addendum  
to  
1995 Amherst Township Comprehensive Zoning Plan  
Prepared: October 23, 2003  
Revised: March 5, 2004

**THIS REPLACES THE DOCUMENT DATED MARCH 1, 2004, DUE TO THE ADDITION OF NEW INFORMATION PERTAINING TO ATTACHMENT 2.**

The preparation of this zoning matrix constitutes the Township's update of the goals and policies set forth in the 1995 Comprehensive Zoning Plan. This update has been undertaken and satisfies the terms of **Service Element 1** in our letter of agreement with the Township dated July 3, 2004 and authorized by the Township's signature on August 12<sup>th</sup>. The agreement specified that the development and refinement of this matrix would include four (4) review meetings with Township officials – the meeting on February 23<sup>rd</sup> was the fifth such meeting. This final revision responds to the outstanding concerns that were raised at the February 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting.

This matrix constitutes the Township's update of the Plan's policies and implementation strategies as determined by the Zoning Commission and Trustees during these review meetings. If this matrix is acceptable to the Township it should become an addendum to the 1995 Comprehensive Zoning Plan. The matrix has summarized the existing goals, policies, and implementation strategies and indicated the extent to which they:

1. Remain valid;
2. Have been implemented;
3. Should continue to be implemented; and/or
4. Have been revised as indicated by the notations in the "Revised Policy/Comments" section of the matrix.

**In some cases (those with a question mark) the review group has not indicated whether a consensus has been reached as to the validity of the policy or implementation strategy.**

Below is a summary of current development trends, which guided the Township as it reviewed and considered the relevance of the recommendations in the existing Plan.

1. Substantial growth has occurred in Amherst Township since the 1995 Plan was adopted, but we believe that this growth does not invalidate its detailed policies and strategies

because the Plan was developed with the expectation that growth and development would continue to occur in and around the township.

2. While Lorain County might still be considered a "largely rural county" as it was when the Plan was adopted, Amherst Township and other communities have experienced rather substantial growth since that time. Prior to 1990, the City of Avon Lake was the fastest growing community with 12.2% population growth between 1980 and 1990; Amherst Township was the next fastest growing community at only 1.6%. Between 1990 and 2000, however, the City of Avon was the fastest growing community (35.9%), followed by Amherst Township (22.9%) and Avon Lake (17.0%).
3. Yet, current population estimates from the U.S. Census show that Amherst Township has grown by 3% between 2000 and 2002. By comparison, Avon is still the fastest growing community with 12% growth over the population in 2000, North Ridgeville and Avon Lake are next with about 5% growth.
4. Amherst Township had 2,228 owner-occupied units in 1990; in 2000 there were 15% more such units (2,551), but in both years owner-occupied units have represented about 86% of the total. Conversely, there were 302 renter-occupied units in 2000, which is about 3% fewer than the 311 occupied rental units in 1990; however, renter-occupied units continue to represent about 11% of the total.
5. Economic development along SR 58 and the construction of the turnpike interchange were both anticipated when the 1995 Plan was developed.
6. The Township reviewed:
  - a. The Sewer Service Agreement between the County and the City of Lorain;
  - b. The sewer capacities in the agreement;
  - c. Current utilization compared to those capacities; and,
  - d. Those sewer capacities compared to development potential in the sewer service areas under both the current zoning and if development were to occur as recommended in the 1995 Comprehensive Zoning Plan.

In formulating its recommendations the Township is aware that existing sewer capacities will not accommodate either the development permitted under the current zoning or the amount of development as recommended in the 1995 Plan. It is further recognized that the proposed areas for non-residential development extend beyond the existing sewer service area boundaries. Statistical summaries indicating the lack of sewer capacity are included in Attachment 1 to the matrix.

7. The certified 2003 tax base distribution in Amherst Township 82% residential and 18% non-residential. If development of vacant land in the Township occurs according to current zoning, the Township's additional real estate tax base, at "full build-out", would be 39% residential and 61% non-residential (retail, office, industrial). If development in the Township, again at "full build-out", occurs according to the 1995 Plan recommendations the Township's additional real estate tax base would shift to 51% residential and 49% non-residential. The above figures showing property value at "full build-out" include estimates of potential development value per acre of vacant land in addition to the certified value of existing development. A summary of these estimates is included in Attachment 2.

8. Based on this review the Township has determined that the following items are highest priority next steps.
  - a. Developing a detailed open space/natural area preservation plan.
  - b. Establishing a revised estimate of the number of lots (development capacity) that can be accommodated in the southeastern portion of the Township.
  - c. Assessing the existing conditions along SR 58 to identify the “threats” and “opportunities” with respect to property ownership, physical attributes and development potential of the land in order to more fully understand what is needed from an access management plan and to guide potential zoning decisions.
  - d. Developing an access management plan for the SR 58 corridor in conjunction with the County and the State.
  - e. Evaluating whether the setback requirements for parcels along SR 58 should be adjusted to preserve land area for the future construction of additional lanes.
  - f. Pursuing development and implementation of planned development/conservation development regulations.
  - g. Implementing some, or all, of the zoning recommendations for the SR 58 corridor.

I Summary of 1995 Goals	The Goal:		Revised Goals/Comments
	Continues to be Valid	Has Been Substantially Implemented	
A. <u>Economic Development</u> (P. 17)			
1. Increase Opportunities to Capture "Fair-Share" of Expected Regional Economic Development	YES	--	This continues to be an ongoing implementation process. <b>The Township should continue to strive for a balance between residential development and new jobs created.</b>
2. Assure Quality Development Standards and Traffic Management in E. D. Areas	YES	--	This continues to be an ongoing implementation process.
B. <u>Residential</u> (P. 17)			
1. Create Residential Patterns in Recognition of Adjacent Non-residential, Highway & Utility Uses	YES	?	It was suggested that a revised estimate of . . . be made to determine the number of lots (or the capacity) in the southeastern portion of the Township.
2. Preserve "Open Environment" of Township Through Flexible Zoning (e.g., conservation zoning)	YES	NO	
3. Provide Opportunities for a Variety of Housing-Type Choices	YES	NO	
C. <u>Recreation</u> (P. 17)			
1. Create Open Space Network Throughout Twp	YES	NO	It was suggested that creation of an open space plan should be a top priority and such plan should include identifying: 1) the significant natural resources to be preserved; 2) priority sites/locations for acquisition or for which the donation of conservations easements should be encouraged and promoted.
2. Formalize a Land Acquisition Plan for Parks	YES	NO	
D. <u>Transportation</u> (P. 18)			
1. Improve the Transportation Network	YES	?	
2. Ensure that New Streets are Interconnected	YES	?	

I Summary of 1995 Goals	The Goal:		Revised Goals/Comments
	Continues to be Valid	Has Been Substantially Implemented	
Among Adjacent Parcels with Similar Land Uses			
E. <u>Administrative</u> (P. 18)			
1. Provide A Full Range of Municipal Services	YES	NO	Define what is included in the "full range of municipal services." <b>The group agreed that such definition continued to be important.</b>
2. Minimize Residential Tax Burdens	YES	--	This continues to be an ongoing implementation process.

II Summary of 1995 Development Policies	The Policy:		Revised Policy/Comments
	Continues to be Valid	Has Been Substantially Implemented	
A. <u>General Commercial Policies</u> (P. 23)			
1. Provide Competitive Locations for Development	YES	<b>PARTIALLY</b>	The locations identified in the Plan continue to be valid as they correspond to areas with sewers and major arterial corridors, but the zoning to enable such development in these locations has not been <b>fully</b> implemented. <b>However the Zoning Commission has recently responded to and approved requests for GB zoning in locations consistent with the Plan.</b>
2. Provide Limited Commercial Expansion at "Central Lorain Corridor" Intersections	YES	N/A	ODOT identifies the Central Lorain Corridor as a proposed project, but this policy does not require action until the Corridor is further defined.
B. <u>Route 58 Corridor Policies</u> (P. 24-27)			
1. Maintain Ackerman Road General Business District	YES	YES	
a. Add More Complete Parking Setback and Landscaping Standards	YES	YES	
b. Establish Location, Maximum Coverage and Screening Criteria for Bulk Storage	YES	YES	
c. Limit Commercial Property Access to SR 58	YES	?	<b>An access management plan should be adopted, based at least in part on the draft Access Management Plan developed by the County. This plan should consider Marginal Roads on both sides of SR 58.</b>
2. Establish Office/Industrial District Near Penn Central Railroad Tracks	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>This land has been annexed to the City of Amherst.</b>
3. Retain Middle Ridge Road General Business District	YES	YES	
a. Improve Development Standards	YES	YES	
b. Consider Township Government Facilities at this Location	YES	NO	

II Summary of 1995 Development Policies	The Policy:		Revised Policy/Comments
	Continues to be Valid	Has Been Substantially Implemented	
4. Establish I-80/SR 58 Office/Retail District	YES	NO	Only GB-1 districts are shown to be at this intersection.
5. Focus Economic Development Around I-80	YES	NO	Taking action to implement this policy is increasingly important as construction of the I-80/SR 58 interchange nears completion.
6. Apply Mixed-use Retail/Office/Industrial district Along SR 58 Corridor	YES	NO	No MU-1 district has been applied to the zoning map. <b>Based on the current understanding of the sewer boundaries and capacities there was some discussion that the western boundary of the non-residential areas be moved farther east and higher density residential be considered at the western edge of this non-residential corridor.</b>
a. Permit Hotels, Restaurants & Auto Dealers	YES	YES	These uses are permitted in the Zoning Resolution, but corresponding districts have not been identified on the map. See also comment for § II.B.5. above.
b. Strictly Limit Outdoor Bulk Storage	YES	YES	
7. Apply Neighborhood Business District South of MU-1 District (Cited Above), Around SR 113	YES	NO	No NB-1 district has been applied to the zoning map.
a. Introduce Broader Retail Options	YES	YES	
b. Permit Administrative Offices as Uses	YES	YES	See comment for § II.B.6.a. above.
c. Conditionally Permit Auto Dealers & Service Stations	YES	?	The MU-1 zoning regulations conditionally permit auto service stations, but no other automotive uses.
d. Strengthen Parking Setback & Landscaping Standards	YES	YES	
8. Protect Adjacent Residential Districts With Strict Rear Setbacks in NB-1 Districts	YES	YES	
9. Modify General Business District South of SR 113	YES	YES	

II Summary of 1995 Development Policies	The Policy:		Revised Policy/Comments
	Continues to be Valid	Has Been Substantially Implemented	
a. Add More Complete Parking Setback and Landscaping Standards	YES	YES	
b. Location, Maximum Coverage & Screening Criteria for Bulk Storage	YES	YES	
C. <u>Residential Policies</u> (P. 19-22)			
1. Create Residential Patterns in Recognition of Adjacent Non-residential, Highway & Utility Uses	YES	--	It is the continuing responsibility of the Township to minimize negative impacts of non-residential uses on adjacent residential uses.
a. 12,500sf Lots North of I-80 & East of SR 58	YES	NO	Permitted in Zoning Resolution (R-2 districts), but such districts have not been applied in this location on the map. <b>Consensus was that the lot sizes in this area, for new development should be increased to 15,000 sq. ft.</b>
b. 1/2ac Lots South of I-80 & East of SR 58	YES	NO	Permitted in Zoning Resolution (R-1 districts), but such districts have not been applied in this location on the map.
c. Permit Densities in "Isolated Land Areas" Similar to Densities in Surrounding Parts of Amherst or South Amherst	YES	?	<b>Some</b> area surrounded by Amherst (at Middle Ridge Rd and Pyle-South Amherst Rd) is zoned RMF-1; <b>most however is zoned R-AG</b> . And, area surrounded by South Amherst (north of SR 113 and east of Pyle-South Amherst Rd) is zoned R-AG.
d. Preserve Rural Densities in the Western Portion of the Township	YES	YES	
e. Permit Higher Densities Near Business Districts East of SR 58 and North of I-80 to Buffer Single-Family Areas	YES	NO	Residential zoning in this area continues to be the low-density districts (i.e., R-AG and R-1 districts).
2. Encourage Flexible Zoning to Permit PUD	Yes	NO	
a. Allow Flexibility in Density to Accommodate Unique Site Constraints	?	NO	<b>The validity of these implementation strategies will be addressed at the time the planned development/conservation development regulations are developed.</b>

II Summary of 1995 Development Policies	The Policy:		Revised Policy/Comments
	Continues to be Valid	Has Been Substantially Implemented	
b. Provide Density Bonuses for Residential Areas Adjacent to Non-residential Uses According to Prescribed Formulae	?	NO	See comment for § II.C.2.a. above.
3. Rezone Appropriate, Isolated Light Industrial Areas to Reduce Impact on Adjoining Residential Areas	YES	NO	The area west of Quarry Rd and north of Rice Rd, like the area between SR 2 and North Ridge Rd, is zoned LI and surrounded by R-AG.
<b>D. <u>Central Lorain Corridor Policies</u> (P. 28-30)</b>			
1. Apply Modified Neighborhood Business District at Middle Ridge Road	YES	NO	No NB-1 district has been applied to the zoning map.
2. Depending on the Corridor Development, 12,500sf Lots Should Apply to:	YES	N/A	No action is expected until such time as construction of the Central Lorain Corridor becomes definite. <b>Policy should shift to 15,000 sq. ft. lots. See also comment in §II.C.1.a. above.</b>
a. Area Between Central Lorain Corridor and Eastern Township Line	YES	N/A	See comment for § II.D.2. above.
b. Area North of I-80 and East of SR 58	YES	N/A	See comment for § II.D.2. above.
3. Evaluate Triangular Area Between I-80 & Elyria for Office/Industrial Use	YES	?	This area should be evaluated regardless of whether the Central Lorain Corridor is built, as permitting increased development intensity would help to prevent annexation of land into the City of Elyria.
4. Evaluate Area North of SR 113 and east of Corridor for Industrial and Retail Uses	YES	N/A	See comment for § II.D.3. above.
5. Apply Modified Neighborhood Business District at SR 113	YES	NO	See comment for § II.D.3. above.
6. Area South of SR 113 Between the Corridor and Elyria Should be Developed at Residential	YES	N/A	See comment for § II.D.3. above.

II Summary of 1995 Development Policies	The Policy:		Revised Policy/Comments
	Continues to be Valid	Has Been Substantially Implemented	
Densities Similar to Densities in Elyria			
E. <u>Recreation/Open Space Policies</u> (P. 30-32)			
1. Develop Recreational Land Acquisition Plan to:	YES	?	
a. Purchase 25 ac Immediately	YES	?	Based on the current population (about 7,825), 37 ac. of recreational land should be added to the existing 10 ac. in order to meet the national minimum standards.
b. Purchase .78-1.3 ac/yr to Meet Pop. Growth	YES	?	Because population growth is more rapid than initially anticipated, 1.0 – 1.7 ac/yr of recreational land would be required to keep up with population growth if growth continues at the average rate between 1990 and 2002.
c. Assure Reasonable Distribution of Parks	YES	--	This will continue to have an ongoing implementation process.
d. Utilize Parcels That Are Too Small for Other Conforming Residential Development	YES	--	This will continue to have an ongoing implementation process.
2. Preserve Open Space to Maintain Character of Township	YES	NO	
a. Develop Trails Along Utility Corridors	YES	?	
b. Require PUDs to:	Yes	NO	
1) Reserve Land for Open Space & Recreation	Yes	NO	
2) Link Adjacent Projects With Trails	Yes	NO	
c. Protect Riparian Areas	YES	No	
F. <u>Transportation Policies</u> (P. 32-33)			

II Summary of 1995 Development Policies	The Policy:		Revised Policy/Comments
	Continues to be Valid	Has Been Substantially Implemented	
1. Support Proposed Interchange at I-80 & SR 58	YES	YES	Construction of the interchange has begun.
2. Support North-South Central Lorain Corridor	YES	--	See comment for § II.A.2. above.
3. Assure Appropriate Street Inter-Connectivity Among Similar Land Uses Including Roads:	YES	--	This will continue to have an ongoing implementation process.
a. from SR 58 to SR 113 in the Northwest Quadrant	YES	NO	Because Amherst Township and Lorain County are unlikely to develop this roadway, developers could be required to build sections of the road as new developments are approved.
b. from SR 58 to SR 113 in the Southwest Quadrant	YES	NO	See comment for § II.F.3.a. above.
4. Related to § II.B.3., Street Connections that Would Adversely Affect Residential Areas Should be Avoided	YES	--	This will continue to have an ongoing implementation process.
5. Ensure Adequate Alternative Routes and Capacities to Minimize Increased "Regional" Traffic on Middle Ridge and Oberlin Roads	YES	--	This will continue to have an ongoing implementation process.
6. Evaluate Widening State Route Intersections at:	YES	?	
a. SR 113 East of SR 58	YES	?	
b. SR 58 South of SR 113 to Township Line	YES	?	
7. Consider Extending Albrecht West to SR 58	YES	NO	
G. <u>Development Quality/Image Policies</u> (P. 33)			
1. Revise Non-residential Zoning District Standards	YES	YES	

II Summary of 1995 Development Policies	The Policy:		Revised Policy/Comments
	Continues to be Valid	Has Been Substantially Implemented	
to Ensure:			
a. Adequate Landscaping & Buffering	YES	YES	
b. More Limited Access	YES	YES	
c. Other Suitable Development Controls	YES	YES	
2. Create L&WV Railroad "Stops" with Supporting Facilities (e.g. Parking) in Appropriate Residential/Recreational or Commercial Places	YES	?	
3. Develop Township Governmental Facilities in Central Locations Where:	YES	NO	
a. Business (Retail) Objectives Are Reinforced	YES	NO	
b. A Township Center or Focal Point is Created	YES	NO	

III Outline of Implementation Measures	Implementation Measure:		Revised Implementation/Comments
	Continues to be Valid	Has Been Substantially Implemented	
A. <u>Proposed Amendments to the Zoning Resolution</u> (P.35-37)			
1. Create New Zoning Districts/Amendments	YES	YES	Most proposed amendments and new zoning districts have been adopted, with the exception of allowing greater flexibility in residential zones and permitting auto uses in MU-1 districts.
a. Establish New Mixed Use Office/Retail/Industrial District and Apply to SR 58 Corridor	YES	YES	The MU-1 district has been created in the resolution but no such district has been implemented on the map.
1) Permit Hotels, Restaurants, Auto Sales	YES	YES	
2) Outdoor Storage is Conditional Use	YES	NO	Not Permitted in MU-1 zoning regulations
3) Create Development/Landscape Regs	YES	YES	
b. Establish New Industrial/Office District and Apply on SR 58 at Penn Central Tracks	YES	YES	The MU-2 district has been created in the resolution but no such district has been implemented on the map.
c. Establish New Single-Family Residential District (R1-3) to Permit .5 ac Lots South of I-80 and East of SR 58	YES	?	The existing R-1 district permits .5 ac lots, but this district has not been broadly applied in the given location.
d. Amend Neighborhood Business District	YES	YES	
1) Add Broader Retail Options	YES	YES	
2) Permit Administrative Offices	YES	YES	
3) Permit Auto Sales/Service as Conditional Uses	YES	NO	NB-1 zoning regulations conditionally permit auto service stations, but no other automotive uses.

III Outline of Implementation Measures	Implementation Measure:		Revised Implementation/Comments
	Continues to be Valid	Has Been Substantially Implemented	
4) Establish More Definitive Parking Setback/Landscaping Standards	YES	YES	
5) Apply at SR 113/SR 58 & SR 58/Middle Ridge Rd Intersections	YES	NO	NB-1 district has not been applied on the zoning map.
2. Amend General Business District	YES	YES	
a. Establish More Definitive Parking Setback/Landscaping Standards	YES	YES	
b. Establish Location, Maximum Coverage & Screening Criteria for Bulk Storage	YES	YES	
3. Add PUD as Conditional Use in R1-1, R1-2 & R1-3 Districts	Yes	NO	
a. Permits SF, Cluster & Attached Units	Yes	NO	
1) Site Must be at Least 50 Acres	Yes	NO	The size of the planned developments is subject to further review as the regulations are reconsidered.
2) 20% of Area Must be Open Space	Yes	NO	The amount of open space in planned developments is subject to further review as the regulations are reconsidered.
b. Two Different Densities Would Be Permitted	?	NO	The validity of these implementation strategies will be addressed at the time the planned development/conservation development regulations are developed.
1) Statistical Density of Conventional Zoning When Site Has One of:	?	NO	See comment for § III.A.3.b. above.
a) Unique Natural Features	?	NO	
b) Limited Road Access	?	NO	

III Outline of Implementation Measures	Implementation Measure:		Revised Implementation/Comments
	Continues to be Valid	Has Been Substantially Implemented	
c) Irregular Size or Shape	?	NO	See comment for § III.A.3.b. above.
d) Significant Easements or ROW	?	NO	
2) Additional 2 du/ac Where Adjacent to:	?	NO	See comment for § III.A.3.b. above.
a) Major Existing/Proposed Highway	?	NO	
b) Active Railroad Track	?	NO	
c) Existing/Proposed Non-residential Zoning	?	NO	
c) Township Could Predetermine Eligible Areas as Amendment to Zoning Map	?	NO	See comment for § III.A.3.b. above.
4. Additional Changes in Resolution	YES	YES	
a. Break-out "Government Buildings" Category	YES	NO	
b. Establish PUD Site Plan Review Procedures	YES	YES	
c. Establish Review Criteria	YES	YES	
1) Suitable Site Layout	YES	YES	
2) Adequate Landscaping	YES	YES	
3) Safe/Efficient Site Circulation	YES	YES	
4) Street Access to Each Property	YES	YES	

III Outline of Implementation Measures	Implementation Measure:		Revised Implementation/Comments
	Continues to be Valid	Has Been Substantially Implemented	
5) Adequate Lighting	YES	YES	
d. Clarify Responsibilities of Zoning Board of Appeals and Zoning Commission	YES	YES	
e. Amend Zoning Map	YES	NO	
1) Apply New Commercial or Industrial Districts Along SR 58 Corridor	YES	NO	New commercial and industrial districts have been created in the zoning resolution, but no such districts have yet been applied to the zoning map.
2) Eliminate Isolated Industrial Zones from Predominantly Residential Areas	YES	NO	The area west of Quarry Rd and north of Rice Rd, like the area between SR 2 and North Ridge Rd, is zoned LI and surrounded by R-AG.
<b>B. <u>Administrative Measures</u> (P. 38-39)</b>			
1. Utilize Citizens for Economic Growth to:	<b>YES</b>	--	
a. Promote New Business in the Township	YES	--	
1) Institute Public Relations Campaign	YES	NO	
2) Prepare Marketing Brochures, Advertising Slogans, etc.	YES	NO	
3) Prepare Renderings of SR 58 Economic Development Corridor	YES	NO	
b. Identify Means to Facilitate Business Expansion	YES	?	
c. Explain the Merits of the Plan to Community	YES	?	

III Outline of Implementation Measures	Implementation Measure:		Revised Implementation/Comments
	Continues to be Valid	Has Been Substantially Implemented	
d. Evaluate/Improve Current Administrative Procedures	YES	?	
2. Develop Recreational Land Acquisition Plan	YES	?	
a. Raise/Reserve Annual Funds	YES	?	
b. Determine Priority Sites for Future Parks	YES	?	
c. Determine Feasibility of Using Existing Utility Corridors as Part of Open Space System	YES	?	
3. Evaluate Development of Civic/Community Center East of SR 58, North of Middle Ridge Rd	YES	?	
4. Zoning Commission Should Reevaluate Plan Annually	YES	--	This is what is currently being done.
a. Refine Policies as Appropriate	YES	--	
b. Evaluate Plan Implementation Progress	YES	--	
c. Revise List of Actions to Pursue	YES	--	

# Attachment 1

## Alternative 1

### Existing Sewer Service Area: Existing Zoning

		Service Area 1 Airport	Service Area 2 Middle Ridge Rd	Service Area 3 Rt 113	Total	Units
1	Capacity	290,000	243,000	267,000	800,000	GPD
2	Current Utilization	30,000	60,000	45,000	135,000	GPD
3	Vacant Area	939	1,368	673	2,980	Ac
4	Estimated Sewer Requirements <sup>(1)</sup> (of Line 3; see table below)	361,640	481,430	1,228,350	2,071,420	GPD
5	Total Estimated Demand (Line 2 + Line 4)	391,640	541,430	1,273,350	2,206,420	GPD
6	Service Capacity Surplus/Shortfall (Line 1 - Line 5)	(101,640)	(298,430)	(1,006,350)	(1,406,420)	GPD
6a	Area Surplus/Shortage	(264)	(848)	(551)	(1,663)	Ac

Zoning	Vacant Area (ac)	Sewer Utilization (gpd/ac)	Total Utilization (gpd)
<b>Area 1</b>			
R-AG	872	320	279,040
GB-1	19	2,200	41,800
LI	48	850	40,800
<i>Total</i>	939	385	361,640
<b>Area 2</b>			
R-AG	1,279	320	409,280
R-1	14	600	8,400
LI	75	850	63,750
<i>Total</i>	1,368	352	481,430
<b>Area 3</b>			
R-AG	160	320	51,200
R-MHP	58	3,200	185,600
GB-1	448	2,200	985,600
LI	7	850	5,950
<i>Total</i>	673	1,825	1,228,350

<sup>(1)</sup> Sewer utilization assumptions are as follows:

**Residential Land Uses**

R-AG: .8 d.u./ac. x 400 gallons per d.u. per day = 320gpd/ac.

1/2 ac. lots: 1.5 d.u./ac. x 400 gallons per d.u. per day = 600gpd/ac.

12,500 sf lots: 2.5 d.u./ac. x 400 gallons per d.u. per day = 1,000gpd/ac.

R-MHP: 8 d.u./ac. x 400 gallons per d.u. per day = 3,200gpd/ac.

High-density Residential: 10 d.u./ac. x 250 gallons per d.u. per day = 2,500gpd/ac.

**Non-residential Land Uses**

Commercial: 11,000 sf/ac x .2 gallons per sf per day = 2,200gpd/ac.

Office/Industrial: 1,500gpd/ac.

Industrial: 850gpd/ac.

## Attachment 2

3/5/04

### Tax Base Shift from Development of Vacant Land: Existing Zoning to 1995 Comprehensive Zoning Plan

	Residential		Non-Residential	
	Value	Percent	Value	Percent
2003 Certified Value <sup>(1)</sup>	\$ 110,177,960	82%	\$ 24,675,230	18%
Build-Out at Existing Zoning <sup>(2)</sup>	\$ 423,030,000	39%	\$ 648,380,000	61%
Build-Out as Proposed in Comprehensive Plan <sup>(2)</sup>	\$ 784,060,000	51%	\$ 763,180,000	49%

<sup>(1)</sup> Lorain County Department of Community Development prepared the 2003 certified values; the "Residential" figures include residential and agricultural property and the "Non-Residential" figures include industrial, commercial, utility and exempt property.

<sup>(2)</sup> These figures are calculated using estimates of potential development value per acre of vacant land and include the value of existing development.