

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
SUMMARY MINUTES
OCTOBER 12, 2021
7:00 P.M.

PLEASE TURN OFF CELL PHONES

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Mr. Okum, Chairman

II. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Dave Okum, Steve Galster, Bob Diehl, Don Darby, Tom Hall,
Joe Ramirez, Meghan Sullivan-Wisecup

Staff Present: Carl Lamping, Building Official; Shawn Riggs, City Engineer;
Anne McBride, City Planner

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

IV. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING ON SEPTEMBER 14, 2021

Motion to adopt minutes made by Mr. Galster. Mr. Diehl seconded the motion.

Voice vote take and the minutes were approved with a vote of 7 to 0.

V. REPORT ON COUNCIL

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup presented her report on Council from the September 15, 2021 and October 6, 2021 meetings.

VI. CORRESPONDENCE - NONE

VII. OLD BUSINESS - NONE

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Rt. 4 Corridor Review District Plan
370 Northland Blvd – Aamco Transmission
PUBLIC HEARING (Application #20211317)

All representatives for Aamco were sworn in by Chairman Okum.

Ms. McBride presented her staff report and comments.

Mr. Riggs did not have any comments.

Eric Hermes, 6163 Cabin Creek, Cold Spring, KY, representative for Aamco. Mr. Hermes stated the reason they chose split face block for the sign base was to match the building. He stated there was an awning on the building and the frame is inside the building. The intention is to reuse the awning that was on the building. He presented an old photo that showed the awning. They would like to use the frame with new fabric. Mr. Hermes addressed the building paint that was

not going to be earth tone. He stated the proposed amount of the building to be painted other colors is under the allowed 10%.

Ms. McBride asked if the new awnings would be illuminated.

Mr. Hermes stated that had not been discussed, but wanted to address the channel letters on the front of the building. He stated the wall sign would be illuminated and the letters would project about a foot from the building.

Ms. McBride stated there are code requirements and all the information would need to be provided along with a revised landscape plan, and details on the awnings should the commission chose to move forward, so that staff could review and approve.

Mr. Okum asked Ms. McBride if there was enough information for her to make a recommendation with an awning of the same size and style as there was previously, or would it need to be submitted separately.

Ms. McBride stated the details would need to be seen, if the commission approves it with the awnings, to see that it matches what the action is.

Mr. Okum questioned if the motion stated same frame and size as the existing was, with new fabric, would that be acceptable to staff.

Ms. McBride agreed as long as it specified that it is non-illuminated if that is the desire of the commission. She stated staff would also need the percentage of non-earth tone colors in writing from the applicant.

Mr. Okum asked if there was anyone that wanted to speak in regards to this application.

There was a gentleman that was not sworn in prior that wished to address this project. Mr. Okum advised him that he would swear him in at the podium.

Kurt Klosterman, owner of the property, was sworn in. He stated the awning that is inside the building still has the lights mounted to it. He thought that it would continue to meet the requirements.

Mr. Okum advised that this is being reviewed as a new application. He stated it was approved under a conditional use permit that has expired because the building has been vacant.

Mr. Klosterman understands, he is just addressing the lights being mounted to the framing of the awning.

Mr. Okum stated technology has changed, and he is not sure when those awnings were put on. He stated lighting changes have taken place and it would need to be reviewed and inspected by the building department for safety. He stated that what Ms. McBride had indicated, as Planning Commission, have a feeling one way or the other regarding if it is down lit or illuminated. He stated that the commission has to make a decision during this review if it is acceptable one way or the other.

Mr. Lamping asked Mr. Okum if would be appropriate to ask the applicant if they plan to light it or not.

A representative for the applicant came to the podium, he stated his name off mic. He would like to have the awning illuminated, but will comply with the guidelines granted.

Mr. Okum stated they could review a down lit awning, where the surface of the awning is a solid color and not translucent.

Aamco representative stated that is what it currently is and they want to keep.

Mr. Okum opened up the Public Hearing to the audience. No one came forward and the Public Hearing portion was closed.

Mr. Galster he stated he has no concerns as long as they are within the percentages addressed by Ms. McBride. He has no issues with the awning or the lighting on the awning. Mr. Galster feels the brick or stone on the bottom of the sign is an important aspect of the Corridor Review District. He thinks that should be considered by the applicant and not using material to match the building.

Ms. Sullivan-Wisecup addressed the split block on the sign. She stated at first she wanted to see the brick or masonry base. She does like a more cohesive look. She questioned if there was another reason, besides to match the building, they chose to not go with brick.

Mr. Okum stated the applicant indicated there was no other reason. Mr. Okum questioned if the building was painted. He wanted to make sure the sign base would be the same color.

Mr. Galster asked if the awnings would go back up in the same location so that the discoloration on the building, which was behind the awnings, would not be visible from the street.

The applicant indicated that the awnings would go back in the same location.

Mr. Ramirez asked about the accent color, and if it would be a band around the building.

Mr. Hermes stated the awning would have a blue and red fabric, and the gable trim which is an iron ore color. The door would also be painted blue.

Mr. Darby commented on the base of the sign and believes that symmetry is a good thing.

The Chair will entertain a motion to approve the following project, Aamco Transmission at 370 Northland Boulevard, case #20211317; per specifications and designs provided in our meeting packet as exhibits which were submitted by the applicant prior to the meeting and reviewed by staff. This motion includes the following conditions:

1. Staff and City Planners recommendations and considerations contained in their reports.
2. All four building elevations to be the same as the existing exterior color pallet per the illustration submitted.
3. Special signage conditions are permitted to include the base of the sign being the same material as the building.
4. The awning replacement shall be the same frame and size as the existing with new fabric, downlight, and non-translucent fabric.
5. Whereas all zoning code regulations and conditions not detailed in this motion shall remain in effect.
6. As such any changes to any of the above conditions shall constitute a change of the Approved Plan. Such changes shall require approval of the Springdale Planning Commission.

Mr. Galster made a motion to approve. Mr. Hall seconded the motion. Roll was called and the motion was approved with a vote of 7-0.

B. Minor Development Plan
11200 Princeton Pike – Oak Hills Cemetery Office/Storage Building
(Application #20211318)

Ms. McBride presented her staff report and comments.

Mr. Riggs presented his staff report and comments. He did state that an inspection maintenance agreement was required for the mausoleum project and it was never recorded. He is asking that it be provided before the issuance of the building permit for this project.

Emily Lubbers, project designer from McGill, Smith, Punshon represented the project. She stated the company does a lot of cemetery work and they run into variances that may be required regularly. She addressed the comment that they only presented eight parking spaces. Ms. Lubbers indicated that the storage area of this building is for storage of parking. She stated there will be an additional five spaces for vehicles and maintenance equipment. She noted that if they five indoor spaces and are included that will give them the thirteen spaces needed. Ms. Lubbers stated they did not add a lot of screening to add for flexibility. She stated things like soil and vaults are important to the function of the cemetery. She stated there is an existing maintenance building that will be demolished, and the new one will replace it. She pointed out the old building is not adequate for what they need. Ms. Lubbers stated they chose the location on the site for the new building, because it is a maintenance building, and they wanted to make it less visible from the street. She stated that with the existing vegetation there is only one area that might be visible and it is screened. She stated that from the access drive in the cemetery given the grading the building will not be visible. Ms. Lubbers said the intention is the building will be back in a corner so that it is not visible to the public, but also an area that is not usable for future gravesites. The location is also a good area for proximity to a right of way for utilities. She stated all permits and bonds will be applied for before starting the work. Ms. Lubbers said they are working on locating the final copy from the mausoleum that needs to be submitted.

Mr. Galster stated the only area he has an issue with is identifying the trees that will be removed. He stated from the size of the trees they are substantial, and he would like to make sure everything is being done to build around them. He believes they are landmark trees and need to be preserved.

Ms. Lubbers said that the tree survey that was completed indicated they were large enough that they needed to be replaced. She stated they will most likely not be replaced around this building, the cemetery will use them somewhere else on site. Ms. Lubbers indicated there was a small revision made to the utility connection, so they will need to verify if any trees need to be removed and replaced.

Mr. Galster stated his intent is to preserve the trees not replace them. He asked for specific location so he could make a valued decision. He believes that if something can be moved in order to not destroy the tree that is what needs to be done.

Ms. Lubbers stated the four indicated are the only ones on site that need to be removed.

Mr. Galster wanted to know what the purpose of removing these trees would be.

Ms. Lubbers stated the purpose was to get the utility easement.

Mr. Hall wanted to know if the plan was to remove the trees, or to remove and replace these trees somewhere else on the site.

Ms. Lubbers stated the plan is to remove the trees and replace them in accordance with the city tree preservation plan.

Mr. Hall he again questioned removing the existing trees and replace them or remove the existing trees and replace with another tree.

Ms. Lubbers stated they would remove the existing trees and plant new trees elsewhere on the cemetery site.

Mr. Hall asked if the existing trees would be destroyed.

Ms. Lubbers stated removing and replacing them was not considered. She stated it is something that could be considered.

Mr. Okum asked Mr. Hall to restate his question.

Mr. Hall said the four trees that were outlined on the plan.

Mr. Galster stated they did not know where the four trees were located.

Ms. McBride stated they were noted on the plan at the northeast corner of the building.

Mr. Hall restated his question for Mr. Okum.

Mr. Okum stated code says they have to replace the four trees. He is understanding the applicant stated they will look at the utility issue. Mr. Okum stated taking out trees to put in a gas line, sewer line, and waterline seems to be a shame. He believes they need to do whatever they can to preserve the trees.

Mr. Riggs pointed out the four trees noted to be removed are not in the utility easement it is located within a proposed detention pond.

Mr. Okum questioned Mr. Riggs about other ways to handle this.

Mr. Riggs stated changing the size of the detention basin may do more harm than good.

Mr. Okum asked how much water they are retaining.

Mr. Riggs stated around 11,000 cubic feet.

Mr. Okum asked if it was a tank release.

Mr. Riggs stated they could but this is as it is proposed.

Mr. Okum stated he was not trying to design it for them he was trying to preserve the trees.

Mr. Riggs said they could reduce the volume, they are above what is required.

Mr. Darby questioned if it was prohibited to uproot and relocate these trees based on the size.

Ms. McBride stated that it was not possible.

Mr. Ramirez wanted to address the gravel parking. He stated they may want to take a look at the request because he was on the Board of Zoning and he does not know that it will be approved.

Ms. Lubbers stated that areas with heavy equipment being run on have a tendency to destroy asphalt. She stated concrete is an option but the

maintenance on it is a lot. She stated Oak Hill has the equipment to maintain gravel.

Mr. Okum asked Mr. Riggs if the gravel would reduce their impervious service ratio.

Mr. Riggs stated the way the calculation is for Springdale, gravel is calculated as impervious. He stated it is so minor there is no benefit to go one way or the other with it.

Mr. Okum stated that if he is hearing correctly, the preservation of the four trees would be preferred by the commission.

Ms. McBride made the comment that staff will write the comment that the commission should not be writing recommendations to the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Mr. Okum asked about the landscaping around the building.

Ms. McBride stated that is a BZA issue. The issues in front of this commission are the reduction in parking spaces, the building materials, and the site plan itself. The seven variances that have been filed are for consideration of the Board of Zoning Appeals. There are three other issues that the applicant needs to address to comply with code or file another application with the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Mr. Okum asked about the screening of bulk materials.

Ms. McBride stated that is a requirement of the code that they will comply with or file another application.

Mr. Okum questioned as long as they comply with code and address the tree survey, which is required, and do replacement or preserve those four trees then they can.

Ms. McBride stated that was correct.

The Chair will entertain a motion to approve the following project, Oak Hill Cemetery Office/Storage Building at 11200 Princeton Pike, case #20211318; per specifications and designs provided in our meeting packet as exhibits which were submitted by the applicant prior to the meeting and reviewed by staff. This motion includes the following conditions:

1. Staff, City Engineer, and City Planners recommendations and considerations contained in their reports.
2. This approval is conditional on Approval by The Springdale Board of Zoning Appeals, of the identified variances as stipulated and required.
3. The tree preservation and replacement conditions require that a tree survey and plan for replacement shall be required to comply with code. Preservation of the four specimen trees would be preferred by this commission.
4. Whereas all zoning code regulations and conditions not detailed in this motion shall remain in effect.
5. As such any changes to any of the above conditions shall constitute a change of the Approved Plan. Such changes shall require approval of the Springdale Planning Commission.

Mr. Darby made a motion to approve. Ms. Sullivan-Wisecup seconded the motion.

Roll was called and the motion was approved with a vote of 7-0.

C. Minor Development Plan
12025 Tricon Road – Proampac Addition
(Application #20211319)

Ms. McBride presented her staff report and comments.

Mr. Riggs presented his staff report and comments.

Matthew Howe, Casler Design, 10805 Indeco Dr, is working as the applicant with JTF Construction, Choice One Engineering, and Hudepohl Structural Engineering on this project. He stated Proampac has the need to increase their production and the equipment requires a 70 foot tall building addition.

Mr. Okum asked how tall it would be.

Mr. Howe stated it would be 70 feet above the finished floor and a dock elevation so it is 74 feet.

Mr. Okum asked if this for housing equipment.

Mr. Howe stated it is for one of the products produced by this company. He addressed the curb cut on the Centron side of the property, stating they met with the Building Official and Fire Department. The Fire Department is the one that requested to get access to the different elevations of the building. The Fire Department was concerned about getting the ladder truck to the portion of the building that would be blocked by the new addition. Mr. Howe stated the same reasoning with cutting back of the spur line to access the area with the fire truck.

Mr. Okum asked if the spur line was used, and abandoned past the property.

Mr. Howe stated it is not, and it was abandoned when Avon moved out of the building. He stated it is capped off just past where it crosses the street.

Mr. Riggs stated Public Works is working with CSX to get verification they can remove the railroad crossing.

Mr. Lamping asked the applicant if they have been in contact with CSX.

Mr. Howe stated he personally has not and is not sure if anyone has.

Mr. Okum stated dealing with CSX could be forever to get answers.

The Chair will entertain a motion to approve the following project, Oak Hill Cemetery Office/Storage Building at 11200 Princeton Pike, case #20211318; per specifications and designs provided in our meeting packet as exhibits which were submitted by the applicant prior to the meeting and reviewed by staff. This motion includes the following conditions:

1. Staff, City Engineer, and City Planners recommendations and considerations contained in their reports.
2. Whereas all zoning code regulations and conditions not detailed in this motion shall remain in effect.
3. As such any changes to any of the above conditions shall constitute a change of the Approved Plan. Such changes shall require approval of the Springdale Planning Commission.

Mr. Hall made a motion to approve. Mr. Diehl seconded the motion. Roll was called and the motion was approved with a vote of 7-0.

D. Minor Modification to a PUD
1145 Strategic Parkway – Sleep Number
(Application #20211320)

Ms. McBride presented her staff report and comments.

Mr. Riggs presented his staff report and comments.

John Cumming, Strategic Capital Partners, representative for the project stated that Sleep Number has started their interior renovations and hope to occupy this property by the end of 2021. He stated they will have an assembly, distribution center which will account for approximately 15% of their demand around the country. The other part of their operation is a bedding collection fulfillment center. He stated they currently have an existing facility in Minneapolis that will be moving to the Springdale area. It will be the only fulfillment center for accessory type products in the country. Mr. Cumming stated they will have approximately 70 employees in this facility by the middle of 2022. He stated the intent with this application is to meet the ordinance, and not ask for variances. Mr. Cumming stated they want to work with staff to meet the code and find good alternatives. He introduced David Wright with the Kleingers Group who has been involved all the way through the project.

David Wright, Kleingers Group, representative for the project stated they are trying to satisfy the current code. He stated one thing they have heard through the years is how high Crescentville Road is in comparison with the roof of this building. He stated that Crescentville Road is approximately three feet higher than the roofline of the building. Mr. Wright stated there is about 300 feet between Crescentville Road and the north face of building three. He stated trying to determine the best way to screen rooftop equipment from public view, in their opinion, was something up closer to the line of site. Mr. Wright stated this is why they chose fencing and landscaping as their screening option along the right of way. They understand there are other methods, and they have been discussed with staff in recent days.

Mr. Okum asked if their proposal was to hide behind a fence all of the nice landscaping along the road.

Mr. Wright stated it would be hidden behind a fence until it grew. He stated the good thing about landscape is it matures and looks great, the bad thing is that at install it is not providing the screening. He stated they are trying to satisfy the condition of right now with the fence. They are open to other options.

Mr. Okum stated at the staff meeting there was a lot of discussion, and he does not support a fence along the road. He questioned doing mounding to create an elevation change.

Mr. Wright stated there is not enough room for that.

Mr. Okum asked how many units there would be on the roof.

Mr. Cumming said that one of the alternatives proposed was installing a dense line of ten foot high evergreen trees along the road. He stated this would provide the screening and interact with the landscaping. He stated the facility will be fully air conditioned, and believes there to be about 30 units that will need to be on the roof. Mr. Cumming stated the reason they would like to find other alternatives to the screening is because it would be approximately half a million dollars to provide screenings on all those units.

Mr. Darby asked Ms. McBride what would be optimal, the fence or the trees.

Ms. McBride answered stating that screening the rooftop units on the roof like it was required when the PUD was originally approved. She stated they have not

reviewed any landscaping plans and she would defer that to the landscape architect. Ms. McBride stated she has concerns because there has been a significant amount of original plant material lost on that property. She has concerns with long term viability of evergreens there.

Mr. Darby asked what the positives were, because he is hearing negatives in regards to the fence and the trees.

Ms. McBride said screening each rooftop unit on the roof, which is the third option. This was a concern of the Planning Commission and City Council during the original approval process and it was put into the covenants of the PUD.

Mr. Darby asked the applicant what is prohibitive of going with the screening.

Mr. Cumming stated it is mainly the cost. He stated that in reading of the ordinance, in lieu of the individual screening that might be able to utilize fencing or landscaping to solve the same issue.

Mr. Darby stated it has been awhile and he does not recall the original discussion. He asked Ms. McBride if she remembered if it was descriptive that the screening occur the way it was described.

Ms. McBride stated she does not specifically recall and did not have the covenants with her. She does recall there being a lot of discussion about screening on the rooftops.

Mr. Okum stated hours were spent on the way the buildings sat, and he also recalls that when it was excavated that the property was a rock. He stated there was enormous amount of shale taken off of the hillside. Mr. Okum stated that maybe this is why it is a challenge keeping vegetation healthy.

Mr. Wright stated there was shale down at lower elevations and the cut in the hill did also.

Mr. Cumming stated they would like to explore the ten foot tree option.

Mr. Lamping stated there have been a lot of staff meetings to address this request. He stated October 12 a new landscaping plan was received and staff has not had an opportunity to review it.

Mr. Okum would like to get them through the process of what was reviewed and what was submitted. He does not want to be reviewing something staff has not had time to look at. He explained to the applicant he wants to get them all of their approvals, putting conditions on what the code requires and leave it. Mr. Okum stated the rooftop screening could be entertained at the next meeting.

Mr. Darby questioned tabling this until next meeting.

Mr. Okum asked him to hold off for a moment and see where the applicant is on this. He then asked the applicant if they would like the entire request to be tabled, or for them to hear the issues and put the conditions that staff recommended on it.

Mr. Cumming stated they would prefer the latter, they would like to come to an agreement on the balance of the items. They could resubmit for the screening and come back to the next meeting for that.

Mr. Lamping stated that would be as the staff comments were prepared.

Mr. Okum advised of how the motion would go and asked the applicant if that was agreeable. He stated that when they resubmit with the updated, then it would be revisited by the Planning Commission.

The Chair will entertain a motion to approve the following project, Sleep Number at 1145 Strategic Parkway, case #20211320; per specifications and designs provided in our meeting packet as exhibits which were submitted by the applicant prior to the meeting and reviewed by staff. This motion includes the following conditions:

1. Staff, City Engineer, and City Planners recommendations and considerations contained in their reports.
2. The mechanical units shall be screened from view of adjoining properties and/or Public Right of Way. Mechanical units shall be in Staff and Planning Commissions approved enclosure and screening.
3. The west side fence where chain link is requested, shall be a design more consistent with an architectural fencing.
4. Dead plant material be replaced prior to a Certificate of Occupancy being issued.
5. Fencing along Crescentville Road, as requested by the applicant, is NOT APPROVED.
6. Compactors and transformer located on the north and south side of the grounds are approved as shown on the illustration.

Mr. Galster made a motion to approve. Mr. Hall seconded the motion. Roll was called and the motion was approved with a vote of 7-0.

E. Minor Modification to a PUD
800 Kemper Commons Dr – Sam’s Club Fueling Station
(Application #20211324)

Mr. Okum stated that the meeting is being conducted partially by Zoom (Nate Kendall, representative for applicant).

Ms. McBride presented her staff report and comments.

Mr. Riggs presented his staff report and comments.

Nate Kendall, Carlson Consulting Engineers, Civil Engineering Consultants representing Sam’s Club. He stated that he did not have the photometric or landscape plan at the time of the meeting. He did state the plan is to comply with the City and Staff requirements. Mr. Kendall stated the signage on the canopy that was submitted with the four LED markers is Sams preference, but will make whatever is approved work. He stated that they are reducing the impervious area with the added islands. He stated they are removing one existing island, but adding a full perimeter around three sides of the fuel station and four new islands. Mr. Kendall the problem with an island to the west of the site to provide a barrier between the fuel station and the main drive is the delivery for the fuel trucks.

Mr. Lamping pointed out on the submitted drawings what looks to be a new island on the south side of the kiosk that extends to the east and turns to the north. He asked if that was a landscape island.

Mr. Kendall stated it was a new curbed island that will be landscaped.

Mr. Lamping then pointed out on the north side of the canopy, questioning if that was another island.

Mr. Kendall stated it is along with the four endcap islands to the east.

Mr. Lamping questioned whether all of the existing to the south of the new one were curbed or painted.

Mr. Kendall stated they are curbed islands.

Mr. Lamping stated with the curbed islands he believes the traffic will be kept out, and the truck traffic can still be accommodated.

Mr. Kendall stated that existing in the lot, where the fuel station is going, are striped.

Mr. Riggs stated on the plans it was not clear if they would be just concrete or landscaped. Providing the information received from Mr. Kendall it they will be landscaped and that will help with the water quality requirement. Mr. Riggs suggested consideration be given that maybe instead of a curbed island, a mountable curb area be placed in the striped area where the fueling trucks will be delivering. Mr. Riggs believes they may deter other drivers from entering into that area.

Mr. Kendall stated he would be happy to look into that and address this with Sam's Club.

Mr. Ramirez asked how many grades of fuel will be sold in regards to the pricing posted on the canopy.

Mr. Kendall said he does not have an answer, but typically what is shown is what is posted. That would be the pricing for the standard fuel and the diesel. He does not know if they have diesel at all stations or if it will be at this one.

Mr. Ramirez asked if they will have three grades of unleaded fuel.

Mr. Kendall did not know the answer.

Mr. Ramirez asked if it was approved, are the requesting pricing on all four sides.

Mr. Kendall said they would like to put the pricing on all four sides. It would be the lowest grade gas and the diesel price, if diesel is available.

Mr. Ramirez stated the site is so far below grade that he believes the canopy is special to have to draw crowds driving up Kemper Road. He is in favor of it.

Mr. Okum asked Mr. Kendall what his position on something around the columns was in regards to the comment made by staff.

Mr. Kendall responded stating that the submitted drawing is Sam's Club preferred way. He stated if they are told to put some stone around it, he will send that back to the architect and they will probably put some masonry around it.

Mr. Okum stated he has been to different Sam's Clubs and way finding is difficult on most of them. He feels the entrances are fairly narrow, the entry points, and maybe some markings showing the travel direction could help. Mr. Okum questioned if an electric charging station area is being considered in their design.

Mr. Kendall stated they are not proposing an electric charging station as a part of this project.

Mr. Okum questioned since electric is being run to the project if it could possibly be considered. He stated staff has recommended something around the columns. He believes it will be a major improvement to the Sam's business in Springdale. Mr. Okum questioned if the height of the canopy was 36". He stated it is a four foot canopy, and the questioned how far the roof drops down from the top of the canopy.

Mr. Kendall did not know the answers.

Mr. Okum stated he would make an assumption that the soffit is the flat part of the ceiling. He said the architects' drawings show lighting hanging below the canopy and that is not permitted by code.

Ms. McBride stated they are not doing that.

Mr. Kendall stated this is the architects' first stab at the canopy and a proto canopy. He stated they may already have a canopy drawn that meets the code. Mr. Diehl asked how many parking spaces will be lost with this project.

Ms. McBride asked if she could address it because it was in her comments. She stated the application indicates there are 722 parking spaces on the Sam's parcel. They estimate they will lose 167 spots, which would leave them 605 spots. Ms. McBride stated that her calculations determined they would need 480 spaces for the store, kiosk, one space per fuel pump, and one space per employee.

Mr. Kendall pointed out on the aerial from the GIS photo that parking in this area is underutilized and that is why they went with this area for the fuel center.

Ms. McBride asked if this will be a 24 hour facility.

Mr. Kendall stated he did not have an exact answer, but typically the fuel stations shut down with the club.

Ms. McBride stated this is her experience, but if it is a 24 hour facility then they would need a fire suppression on the roof of the canopy. She stated if that is the case they would need to be screened. Ms. McBride stated that most operations only do a suppression if it is a 24 hour operation and the kiosk will be unattended.

The Chair will entertain a motion to approve the following project, Sleep Number at 1145 Strategic Parkway, case #20211320; per specifications and designs provided in our meeting packet as exhibits which were submitted by the applicant prior to the meeting and reviewed by staff. This motion includes the following conditions:

1. Staff, City Engineer, and City Planners recommendations and considerations contained in their reports.
2. If necessary, Staff and Law Directors approval of Covenants.
3. The mechanical units shall be screened from view of adjoining properties and/or Public Right Away. Mechanical units shall be in Staff and Planning Commissions approved enclosure and screening.
4. Landscaping conditions shall be based upon Staff review and approval.
5. Signage is permitted on all four elevations of the canopy as illustrated on the application. The approval includes use of two colors for the LED.
6. Masonry column surrounds on the canopy columns.
7. Whereas all zoning code regulations and conditions not detailed in this motion shall remain in effect.
8. As such any changes to any of the above conditions shall constitute a change of the Approved Plan. Such changes shall require Approval of the Springdale Planning Commission.

Ms. Sullivan-Wisecup made a motion to approve. Mr. Darby seconded the motion.

Roll was called and the motion was approved with a vote of 7-0.

IX. DISCUSSION

Mr. Okum brought up discussion that was brought up at the Staff Meeting. He asked if the Planning Commission was interested in starting the meeting any earlier.

Mr. Galster stated he had no objections to starting earlier. He stated there is City Staff that has to hang out just to kill time.

Mr. Okum asked everyone to think about it before the November meeting.

There was discussion in regards to different times, and the times other jurisdictions did their meetings.

Mr. Okum stated he was available at 6:00 p.m.

The motion was made to move the Planning Commission meeting to convene at 6:00 p.m. Mr. Galster seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken and the time change to 6:00 p.m. was approved 7-0.

X. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Galster moved to adjourn. Ms. Sullivan-Wisecup seconded.

Meeting was adjourned with a voice vote of 7-0.

Respectfully submitted,

_____, 2021 _____
Dave Okum, Chairman

_____, 2021 _____
Robert Diehl, Secretary