

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
SUMMARY MINUTES  
MAY 10, 2022  
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, Tom Hall,  
Joe Ramirez, Meghan Sullivan-Wisecup

Members Not Present: Don Darby

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 APRIL 12, 2022

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

Voice vote taken and the minutes were approved with a vote of 6 to 0.

V. REPORT ON COUNCIL

Ms. Sullivan-Wisecup presented her reports on Council from the April 20, 2022  
and May 4, 2022 meetings.

VI. CORRESPONDENCE - NONE

VII. OLD BUSINESS

A. CONDITIONAL USE  
KREATIVE DREAMS LEARNING CENTER  
12117 Princeton Road  
(Application #20220588)  
CONTINUANCE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Tom Dunn, architect, presented the revised site plan. He stated they noted  
additional parking spaces and will restructure the walls around the dumpster. Mr.  
Dunn stated the fence will be a 48" vinyl fence, not a chain link fence.

Ms. McBride presented her staff report and comments.

Mr. Lamping indicated last minute documents were received from the owner  
stating the pole sign and wall sign will be removed.

Mr. Riggs had no comments.

The Chair will entertain a motion to approve the following project Kreative Dreams Learning Center, 12117 Princeton Pike, case #20220588; 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: Staff and City Planner's recommendations and considerations 1-6 contained in their reports. Whereas all other Zoning Code regulations and conditions not detailed in this motion shall remain in effect. Any changes to 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. Diehl seconded the motion.

Roll was called and the motion was approved with a vote of 6-0.

## VIII. NEW BUSINESS

### A. ROUTE 4 CORRIDOR REVIEW PLAN LA QUINTA FACADE 12150 Springfield Pike (Application #20220724)

Mr. Lamping gave an overview of the project and showed plans of the proposed façade update.

Ms. McBride presented her staff report and comments.

Mr. Riggs had no comments.

Tony Frilling, Glavan Group, stated he did not receive the comments beforehand. Mr. Frilling stated the owner was the applicant and he probably received the email.

Mr. Okum stated he was having a difficult time considering this project because the architect had no knowledge of comments, and the owner was not present for the meeting. Mr. Okum stated he expected some interaction with a representative to answer questions.

Mr. Frilling asked if the comments were extensive. He stated he could probably answer all of the comments and questions.

Ms. McBride ran through the list of comments for the representative to address.

Mr. Frilling responded to the list of comments. He stated this is the fifth La Quinta that his office has been involved with. The colors are brand standard and he showed this with a photo of a currently renovated location.

Mr. Ramirez asked if La Quinta owns the access drive behind the building. He stated it's patched but it needs repaired.

Mr. Frilling stated he was not sure if they owned it.

Ms. McBride stated she is pretty sure La Quinta does own that access drive.

Mr. Ramirez wanted to know if that drive would get repaired.

Mr. Frilling stated he would make sure that it is repaired. He said he cannot say they will fully resurface, but he can repair.

Mr. Okum asked Mr. Lamping if there was a standard the city has for repairs for parking areas. He asked if they would reference it per the code.

Mr. Lamping stated it is in the Property Maintenance Code.

Mr. Diehl asked if it was a company store or a franchise. He also asked how many the owner had.

Mr. Frilling stated it was a franchise and this owner only has the one.

Ms. Sullivan-Wisecup stated she has seen a lot of the renovated La Quinta's and they look very nice. She asked if what they are proposing as the renovations would be exactly to the same look as the locations she has seen.

Mr. Frilling stated that is the new look.

Mr. Hall asked if the owner was notified about the meeting. He asked Mr. Frilling if he has authorization to make changes and if he even knew what the comments were.

Mr. Frilling stated based on the comments he agrees. He cannot authorize resurfacing, but he can get potholes filled.

Mr. Hall stated he would not be able to support the request because of the lack of participation by the owner, and the disadvantage of the representative.

Mr. Galster wanted to address the building materials and colors. He reiterated what Mr. Frilling had stated about not having the ability to change any colors without getting the owners approval.

Mr. Frilling stated that they need Planning Commissions approval. He stated that the owner will do what he has to with the approval given. He stated they provided brand standard and that is what they are following.

Mr. Galster asked if any updated location has gone against the standard. He mentioned a white color, illustrated in the photo provided. He asked if anyone has used a different color than the light grey. Mr. Galster read a portion of the Corridor Review District regulations. He stated his concern is the primary building color, and is that earth tone enough.

Mr. Frilling stated it is a light grey. He stated one board requested that the light grey be replaced by the dark grey so that it did not stand out. He stated he can take the comments back and say the commission is requiring a darker grey.

Mr. Galster asked if a more earth tone, agreeable color could be approved by staff.

Ms. McBride responded stating if staff was given direction, like how much darker the commission would approve. She asked if Mr. Frilling's company has done any more of these renovations in the Cincinnati area.

Mr. Frilling stated he knows of two in Indianapolis.

Mr. Okum stated that without a color palette it will be hard for the commission to react in favor, but they do not want to hold the process up. He stated if he goes to look online there is a whole spectrum of colors.

Mr. Frilling stated there are different markets and they do not do the same color schemes everywhere.

Mr. Okum stated there are two choices. The commission could vote or the representative could ask to continue it. He stated they would like to see something that is more consistent with the Corridor Review District.

Mr. Frilling stated that if the only concern is the light grey color, he would be more than happy to work with staff to find the right color(s).

Mr. Galster stated using more of the other colors and less of the light grey could be an option.

Mr. Frilling stated they could possibly get a dark grey to break up the light color.

Mr. Okum stated working through the color choice is not something that needs to be done at the Planning Commission Meeting. He stated they want to give them an opportunity to make a presentation. He stated in fairness to the community he thinks they need to see a real color palette representing the true colors.

Mr. Ramirez asked if it would help if they had a named color that could be referenced. He stated even if they look at a swatch on paper it will not represent the true color on the building.

Mr. Frilling stated the color is on the drawings. It is Sherwin Williams SW7010, Duck White.

Mr. Okum stated it is white. He suggested instead of a vote, continue this project until the next meeting. He stated he could work with staff and get some guidance.

Mr. Frilling stated the goal right now is to replace the rot on the exterior of the building. He stated they would like to start replacing that before putting on the eave system.

Mr. Ramirez asked if they were making this more difficult than it needed to be. He stated they have the names of the colors and can look them up. He asked if they were going too far with this by making the applicant come back to show what the color looks like.

Mr. Okum stated he is not when he sees Duck White on 90% of the building.

Mr. Frilling pointed out that Sherwin Williams has a color called Black White. He stated it is very dark and not at all white. He stated what they call their colors are meaningless.

Mr. Okum asked Ms. McBride if she had comments because she has worked with other jurisdictions on things like this.

Ms. McBride asked if it was possible for the applicant to get a sample and share it with the chair, if the commission feels comfortable with that.

Mr. Okum stated he would like to verify it is not going to be an entirely white building.

Mr. Ramirez asked if the commission does not like Duck White how do they lead the applicant forward in coming up with another color.

Mr. Okum stated the code is specific and staff should have given him guidance with where the colors run. He stated they cannot design it, but white is white.

Mr. Lamping suggested helping this along with a motion that includes with colors that comply with the Corridor Review District as reviewed and approved by staff. He restated that the building is existing, and the second in this area of the city that has been cited by the department because it needs maintenance. He stated he would appreciate getting it approved with some guidance and direction.

Ms. Sullivan-Wisecup stated that the color does not look white. She stated it looks more like a concrete color. She stated it is not represented well in the photos presented.

Mr. Hall stated he thinks this could be approved by staff and include the approval of the chair.

Ms. McBride stated this is in the Corridor Review District, but so is White Castle and Waffle House. She stated modifications have been made. She wanted to remind the commission that it is difficult to get entities to move off of standards. Ms. McBride stated it is hard to get trades people and they probably have someone lined up to get started.

The Chair will entertain a motion to approve the following project Route 4 Corridor Review, La Quinta Facade, 12150 Springfield Pike, case #20220724; 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: Staff and City Planner's recommendations and considerations contained in their report. This motion also includes that all the building elevations, color palette, shall be reviewed by Staff and Planning Commission Chair for approval. Colors must be consistent with those permitted in the Springdale Corridor Review District. Other conditions shall include the rear drive being repaired and meeting the Property Maintenance Code. Whereas all other Zoning Code regulations and conditions not detailed in this motion shall remain in effect. Any changes to 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. Ms. Sullivan-Wisecup seconded the motion.

Roll was called and the motion was approved with a vote of 6-0.

IX. DISCUSSION

Mr. Okum mentioned Artisan Village (TCM) Final Development Plan, Phase I being on the agenda for June.

X. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Galster moved to adjourn. Mr. Diehl seconded.

Meeting was adjourned with a voice vote of 6-0.

Respectfully submitted,

JUNE 14, 2022 \_\_\_\_\_  
Dave Okum, Chairman

JUNE 14, 2022 \_\_\_\_\_  
Robert Diehl, Secretary