I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Darby.

II. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Dave Okum, Lawrence Hawkins III, Meghan Sullivan-Wisecup, Tom Hall, Joe Ramirez, Don Darby, Richard Bauer

Staff Present: Greg Dale (sitting in for Anne McBride, City Planner), Don Shvegzda, City Engineer; Gregg Taylor, Building Official

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

IV. MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF FEBRUARY 12, 2019

Chairman Darby: The chair will now accept the motion to approve the minutes of our previous meeting of February 12th.

Mr. Okum: So moved.

Mr. Hall: Second.

Chairman Darby: It has been moved and second that the minutes be approved.

(Voice vote taken and the minutes were approved with a vote of 7-0.)

V. REPORT ON COUNCIL

Chairman Darby: Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Hawkins: Thank you Mr. Chairman. City Council met on February 20th this year. Six members were present. We had an introduction of a new employee, Amy Ellis, the Nurse in the Health Department. She comes to us from the City of Hamilton’s Health Department. We had before us Ordinance No. 4-2019, an ordinance authorizing the Mayor and Clerk of Council/Finance Director to execute the Hamilton County Mutual Aid agreement for law enforcement and declaring an emergency. That passed with a 6-0 vote. We had before us Ordinance 5-2019, an ordinance authorizing the City of Springdale, Ohio to enter into an individual payment schedule to a lease/purchase agreement by and between Huntington Public Capital Corporation and the City of Springdale, Ohio, to finance the purchase of a chipper for the City of Springdale and authorizing other documents in connection therewith and declaring an emergency. That did not pass. We had before us Ordinance No. 6-2019, an ordinance declaring certain city property and authorizing the City Administrator to dispose of said surplus property and declaring an emergency which was our old chipper and that was withdrawn with a 6-0 vote because Ordinance No. 5-2019 did not pass. We had Ordinance No. 7-2019 adopting a supplemental appropriation estimated receipts ordinance to adjust appropriations for current expenses and other expenditures and adjust estimated receipts for the City of Springdale, Ohio during the fiscal year ending December 31, 2019. That passed with a 7-0 vote. We had Ordinance No. 8-2019, an ordinance approving a zone change for the real property located at 12000 and 12050 Princeton Pike in the City of Springdale. That was the first reading. We also had Ordinance No. 9-2019, an ordinance approving the Preliminary Development Plan for
the retail property located at 12000 and 12050 Princeton Pike in the City of Springdale. That was also a first reading. That is the storage and the pet daycare facility that we, the commission dealt with. So those were first readings. We also had some spirited discussion with regard to commercial vehicles and their ability to park on our city streets. That concludes my report unless there are any questions or Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup has anything to add.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: Just that the spirited discussion also included parking in driveways as well as on the streets. I just wanted to clear that up so that everybody is on the same page.

Mr. Hawkins: Yes.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: Other than that you did awesome.

Chairman Darby: You’re teasing us right?

Mr. Hawkins: That concludes my report.

Chairman Darby: Thank you very much.

Mr. Okum: Is there going to be a referral to Planning Commission for discussion?

Mr. Hawkins: That is an excellent question and that was referenced that that would be something that usually would come through planning. At the same time there was some discussion with administration that it could be something that Council could go through and discuss in the room but there were some Council members that specifically said that it would be good that it went through Planning Commission. So, right now I think the administration is gathering some other information and we are going to see where we go. Obviously, if there is any input that this commission has with regard to that we can always talk about that under new business that would like us to share with Council. I’d be happy to take that information.

Chairman Darby: You know we’ve got your back right?

Mr. Hawkins: I appreciate that.

Chairman Darby: Any other questions? Before we move on I want to welcome Mr. Dale, who is sitting in for Mrs. McBride this evening.

Mr. Dale: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Darby: You are back home. Okay.

VI. CORRESPONDENCE

None.

VII. OLD BUSINESS

None.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Housing Network of Hamilton County, 242 West Sharon Road, Springdale, Ohio, Final Development Plan. (Application 34743)

Chairman Darby: Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Taylor: Thank you Mr. Chairman. You all last saw this property, I believe in January of last year where the preliminary plan was presented and approved. This is the site and it is a piece of vacant property. This is the plan that you folks approved last year. It indicates a construction of a four unit, basically apartment building for the Housing Network of Hamilton County. This is the plan that is before you tonight as a Final Development Plan. It is consistent with what you had previously viewed in that it is still a four unit apartment building. The only, I would say, significant difference is the driveway configuration which, I’m sure that Mr. Dale and Mr. Shvegzda will discuss with you folks at length. This is a view of the landscape plan, which of course all of this stuff is included in your packet of information that was provided by the owner. I would say, I included the floor plan here just if anybody wanted to refer to it again. It clearly shows that there are four one-bedroom units. They are just under 800 square feet each. This is the building elevations and again I am sure we are going to have, not only some discussion from staff, but also a presentation from the applicant who is here tonight. That is all I have. One other thing, excuse me, I’m sorry. If we go back to the landscaping plans that were included, not the plan view that I showed you on the screen, but the details that are in your packet. They did address the tree preservation requirements and they are in compliance with that. Now that is all that I have.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Mr. Dale.

Mr. Dale: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mrs. McBride had communicated a number of clarifying questions and concerns to the applicant and most of those have been addressed. For example there are some, there was a question about the acreage and what the acreage was with and without the right-of-way. I don’t think that’s any major issue that was responded to. In terms of parking. There is a requirement for six spaces and ten spaces are provided. The code provides that when the number of parking spaces exceeds that required by 30% that there is a requirement for a parking study to demonstrate the need for that and the additional landscaping. Staff has indicated that due to the unique nature of this and the potential need for care givers onsite and so forth that staff did not believe in this instance that that parking study or the additional landscaping was merited. The applicant clarified that the open space exceeded the requirement substantially. Their open space requirement is 30% and they are providing 73.5% of open space. Much of which, as you can see from the plan, is in the rear so that is a substantial open space amount obviously. They clarified that there would be no signage proposed. No site lighting other than the lighting that is attached to the building. A couple of issues that staff has flagged, one of which is the requirement that the materials on the building consist of primarily of brick and or stone. The materials that the applicant is providing is all vinyl sided building and in response to the question, the applicant who can, I’m sure explain, their rational more in detail. It has to do with funding basically that there is a variety of public and grant, private, non-profit grant funding involved and just from a funding prospective that’s the issue that the applicant has raised. I think that’s a question that the commission is going to need to look at. The colors of the building, there was a color pallet enclosed, one of the last pages in your packet shows the colors. It does appear to be an earth-tone color which is what the requirement is. We asked the applicant to bring material and color board, which I saw them carrying earlier so they can share that with the commission. The materials, the brick and stone is probably the most substantial issue related to that aspect of it. In addition, from a landscaping prospective, this gets a little bit confusing. So, let me see if I can explain this. So, on the eastern side of the site, and by the way the issue I am going to be talking about has to do with the parking lot, not the building, the setback of the building is fine. In terms of the parking lot there is a requirement for a 20 foot setback of the parking when it is adjacent to a residential use. The applicant has indicated on their chart that it is, I think they either put 10 or 15 feet in there. On the eastern side, it’s a 20 foot requirement and 18 feet at least as we scaled it is what’s being provided so they are close. They are two feet off in terms of the setback of the parking. There is also an indication, and it is probably hard to see on that, if you look in your actual packet at the landscape plan which is probably about mid-way back in there it is on L-100, you can see it a little bit more. You see a dotted line that shows a setback line. That is not the right setback. The setback requirement would be 20 feet. So, the issue is that those lines are indicated on the map and then the table it talks about, I think it is a 15 or 10 foot setback so the table appears to be incorrect. That line is
incorrect but the bottom line is that the actual setback that they are proposing is just two feet off in terms of the parking. Now, on the west side we have the same issue which is that the table incorrectly identifies the setback required and there is a line on there that shows a setback but in this case the setback itself far exceeds the requirement, it is like 34 feet instead of 20 feet on the parking lot from the western lot line. As you scale it off it is about 30 something feet. So, after all of that confusing explanation, the bottom line is that in terms of that landscaping buffer, they are about two feet off on the eastern side and exceed the requirement on the western side. Perhaps they can explain a little bit more about that. The only other clarifying issue was on the site plan there were some units that were unidentified on the west and east end of the building and that has to do with the trash disposal and pick up. What those are, are actually trash totes. They are basically individual totes for the owners and the way the applicant indicates that the trash will be handled is that the trash is put in the totes and the tenants themselves are responsible for taking the units out for curbside pickup. So, with that we have outlined a series of considerations that you can see on page four of our staff report that we simply clarified the correct site acreage which I think is done. That Planning Commission determine that the parking study and additional landscaping are not warranted and essentially waive that requirement that the site has a minimum of 30% which it exceeds. There is no signage for the development. That there is no freestanding lighting. Then number 6 is where the material issues and the design guidelines would come in. That Planning Commission determine which of the design standards are appropriate to the site or consider modifications to the requirements, again with the materials being the apparent significant issue there and that the landscape plan be revised to address staff comments or Planning Commission consider modifications specifically the two feet on the eastern lot line and that the trash units indicated on the east and west be screened as required. They did submit information in the plans that we think demonstrate that and that the commission approve the method of waste disposal. Those conclude my comments.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Mr. Shvegzda.

Mr. Shvegzda: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Starting off, of course this particular development is proposed to have two driveways with a one-way flow with the eastern drive being the entrance and the western drive being the exit only location. Land development regulations for the City note that only one driveway will be allowed for each sub division lot, however; in this case, we looked at the minimum driveway spacing requirements as noted in the ODOT access manual and they note 50 feet for this particular type of street and a minimum spacing noted in the Hamilton County access management is 35 to 70 feet. What they are proposing here, the minimum distance separating the eastern driveway from the residential driveway to the east of that would be 61 feet. There is 108 feet between the two proposed driveways and 70 feet between the west driveway and the property driveway to the west of the site. Because of that and the fact that it is a one-way type driveway situation it would be our recommendation to approve that. In addition we have multiple parcels that comprise this site with the frontage across Sharon Road being about 180 feet. Along with this they are providing signage and pavement markings which would reinforce the one-way traffic movement. In regards to those traffic signs and pavement markings it is required that those be in accordance with the Ohio Manual Uniform Traffic Control Devices. Regarding the driveways themselves, they consist of all asphalt. We went over those with the Public Works Director. He thought those were sufficient in their composition, but they will need a street opening permit for all of the work done within the right-of-way. As far as traffic, we based on particular usage, there would be fewer than 100 new peak hour trips so no traffic would be required for this site. As far as storm water management they have noted that 3,615 cubic feet of storm water detention is required along with 1,294 cubic feet of water quality volume and both are fulfilled within the proposed detention basin to the north of the building. This particular detention basin has a release point that would release flow to the north. Since there is no actual swale or stream to the north that this would be conveyed in, the applicant is proposing discharging into what is called a level spreader and that allows the water then to go from concentrated flow back to more of a sheet flow type of arrangement and then it will continue on to the north where it will be intercepted by the catch basin that is on the Baldwin Grove property there. The major storm is being conveyed by the
storm sewer system and it’s sized to convey the 100 year major storm so that will work in that regards. The plans also note in front that a corrugated metal pipe culvert system will be utilized to convey the flow within the right-of-way across from west to east. We did discuss that with the Public Works Director and he indicated that the city does not permit corrugated metal pipe within the public right-of-way and they would require reinforced concrete pipe that would also affect how they are intercepting the flow there at the driveway itself. Basically what they are proposing now is a corrugated metal pipe with a metal slot that comes up top and intercepts the flow across the apron an alternate arrangement would have to be determined to supply that particular use. Also, there are some yard inlet types that would need to be specified as far either detailed on the plans or noted as far as ODOT’s particular standards. As far as erosion control, Water Management Sediment Control Bond will be set by the City and will need to be submitted prior to start of construction. Storm water pollution prevention plan will need to be submitted for review by the Public Works Department and an operations and maintenance agreement for post construction water quality must be prepared and recorded as a Covenant. That concludes my comments.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Would the applicants care to come forward please?

Ms. Heil: Good evening, I’m Deanna Heil with City Studios Architecture, I’m the architect for the project.

Ms. Gehm: I’m Gina Gehm, I’m with the Housing Network of Hamilton County. I was the one that was here last January.

Mr. Korte: I am Steve Korte with the Kleingers Group, Civil Engineers and Landscape Architects.

Chairman Darby: Thank you.

Ms. Heil: So, we can answer any questions anybody has. I will start with just the building design and just give a brief overview of that. The building is a U shaped building. It is a single story, a very simple, four unit apartment building. Each of the units are about 780 square feet with a nice overhang and porch space in the front courtyard. We have designed it with all vinyl siding and I’ve brought the color samples with me and also the roof asphalt shingles. They will be a dark color as required. We definitely have designed to meet the affordability of the project for our client and feel that the building is small in scale and simple and that vinyl siding is appropriate. Gina will speak to some cost issue and then she will talk about the landscaping in relationship to the building as well but I can pass these as well. I can pass these around and let you see those and the dark color of shingles whether it be this color or one of these three dark colors we haven’t really decided yet but it will be dark in color. The windows are vinyl windows, white trim, white windows, simple and clean lines for the building.

Ms. Gehm: I’m going to talk about in the context of my larger project to kind of give that information about the affordability that we keep referencing in reference to this vinyl siding. So, when I was here last time I think I mentioned that this is one of three buildings that we are going to be constructed in this project. There is one here in Springdale, which we are really excited to be here. There is one planned to be in Springfield Township and there is one that is planned to be in the City of Cincinnati on Werk Road. The city seems so big right? So, the problem obviously is with having to do 12 units that is a lot of site work to be on three sites. Unfortunately, because of the individuals that we serve in our housing many of them have Medicaid waivers so they are getting Medicaid waivers so they are getting Medicaid waivers because they are not being served in an in-patient type setting. So, they are good to be out and live in the community. They want to live in the community but because of that they also don’t want individuals to be grouped again because then it may not feel so different then being in an institutional type setting. So, there’s kind of a rule that you can’t have more than four individuals with the same disability living in the same site. That means that I have three sites to develop for 12 units which in and of itself isn’t necessarily a problem but I am bringing together a lot of different sources of funds. So, Hamilton County has committed home funds to this project. We have federal home loan banks, affordable housing program funds in this
project and the State of Ohio has committed funds to this project. So, we already have four of our five funding streams. We have one left to go for. Getting the funding isn’t really the hard part. The hard part is that they have funding caps so I can’t put more than a certain number of dollars into any unit. The unit itself isn’t the hard part again but developing three sites for 12 units is really what is costing a great deal of money which is why we are trying to go with pretty simple materials. The units themselves are designed to make sure that someone who has a mobility concern can really use those units well, but unfortunately the one thing that we can’t do is any real upgraded type of materials. They are just going to be kind of your durable cost effective and attractive materials but not, you know the stone, the granite, the hard surface tile, marble, any of those type of materials.

Chairman Darby: Excuse me. Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: Thank you Mr. Chairman. One thing I did want to mention. A cost driver for the project which would not normally be required, and you may want to speak to this because I really don’t know what is 100% driving it but these, the building is intended to be fully sprinkled which is not a building code requirement at all.

Ms. Gehm: Actually, it kind of is, it is not a local building code requirement but last year the State of Ohio passed a law that said that if you use any form of public funds and you serve individuals with disabilities and the individuals with disabilities could not self-evacuate, so there are all of these litmus tests, if they felt that they could not self-evacuate then you have to have the unit sprinkled. It is a great fire safety feature that we love to provide, unfortunately it is also a very expensive feature and as I recently learned, being four units or being 60 units doesn’t really change the cost of that sprinkler system all that much. So, it’s just a very big cost for a little tiny building. Thank you.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Hawkins: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I want to start by saying that you guys’ mission is noble and you guys are doing something great. I know I probably was one that was not supportive when you guys came through last time but I do want you to know that the mission that what you guys are doing I think is fantastic. For me this is about the details and the location and what have you. So, just a couple of questions. In terms of, I know you talked about the cost and I understand that you guys are using a variety of funds. What’s the actual dollar cost difference between if you guys went brick stone verses using all siding?

(Side discussion off mic.)

Ms. Gehm: Okay.

Ms. Gehm: So, five figures.

Chairman Darby: Could you speak into the mic please?

Ms. Gehm: About $15,000.

Mr. Hawkins: Okay, and then with regard to, there is two other sites, with regard to the other sites how do they look in comparison to this layout? Is it the exact same thing?

Ms. Gehm: Identical.

Mr. Hawkins: Okay.

Ms. Gehm: Actually, we even, originally when we came it was a little bit more stocky of a U and we stretched it out because one of the sites is really skinny and we didn’t want to design each one of them differently so they are literally exactly the same.

Mr. Hawkins: That goes for material to?
Ms. Gehm: Absolutely.

Mr. Hawkins: Where are those other ones located?

Ms. Gehm: Okay, so are you familiar with the Brentwood Swim Club? So, we

Mr. Okum: They had a fire there years ago.

Ms. Gehm: Yes they did, in their concession stand. It’s been vacant for quite a while and if you aren’t familiar with it, it is a foreclosure. They were significantly behind on their taxes so we worked with Springfield Township to acquire that site and that is one of the sites. The other one is really close to the corner of Werk and Glenmore. So there is a Family Video. I don’t know how familiar you are with, it is right next door. That is my little skinny site.

Mr. Hawkins: I guess the last question from me with regard to this issue is, is it fiscally impossible for you guys to do the requirements in the code with regard to brick and stone or is it more of a matter of choice in terms of what you are doing with this project and the others.

Ms. Gehm: Honestly, I am leaving funds on the table that I could apply for because I can’t take my per-unit cost up. So, that is my limiting factor. It is not so much that I couldn’t go after more funds, it is that none of those funding sources will let me spend that much per unit. So, unless something significantly changed where we half the number of trees and you know started making other changes to offset that cost that is where I got stuck.

Mr. Hawkins: So is it, you are talking about other things in terms of trees. So, is it contribution to the tree fund that is slowing that up or impacting that to or what?

Ms. Gehm: Unfortunately, I can’t really say it is any one factor because I have all of these contributing factors. I’ve got three different sites. On one of my sites it is really expensive to develop because I have to open up the street and it is a really busy street. So, that one, if for some reason I didn’t have to pay for that I could put brick on all of them. It is just a matter of trading off, at this point I feel like we’ve gotten everything down to where any other cuts are going to be significant in terms of the appearance or the usability of the site or the buildings. We’ve cut and cut as far as we could without compromising what we thought would be neighborhood aesthetics or the usability of the site for the people.

Mr. Hawkins: When you are talking about the cost per unit, we are talking about in a global sense of all three sites?

Ms. Gehm: All three sites, but not just all three sites but also all of the different costs that go in.

Mr. Hawkins: Sure.

Ms. Gehm: It’s not just the hard cost but any of the soft costs and land costs as well.

Mr. Hawkins: So it’s

Ms. Gehm: This site is actually the second most expensive and it is not by much.

Mr. Hawkins: That is what I was going to say. They all probably have different total costs.

Ms. Gehm: Right.

Mr. Hawkins: Okay.
Ms. Heil: This has more money in landscaping. Another one has more money

Ms. Gehm: Opening the street.

Mr. Hawkins: Okay. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Darby: Before I move on to another light I just want to interject a question that will probably be blended into your remaining answers. You mentioned the different kinds of considerations that is related to costs with the different sites and you are trying to be, to make them all the same, does the municipality's code constitute one of those contributing factors?

Ms. Gehm: So, City of Cincinnati has been pretty straight forward, their code is pretty laid out. They are not, I think the biggest difference has been just that this is a Tree City USA. Other than that I can’t think of anything that was more restrictive than any others per se. I feel like Springfield Township’s was maybe just a little bit less prescriptive than some of the other ones. I don’t know how to describe that.

Chairman Darby: I’m addressing specifically the building materials.

Ms. Gehm: Oh no, this is the only prescription for building materials. Neither of the other two codes said anything about it right?

Ms. Heil: Correct.

Chairman Darby: Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: Thank you Mr. Chairman. When I first got these plans I looked at this and the very first thing I thought of was that these look like sheds or like modular homes and I am not exactly sure that that is the aesthetic that we were thinking when we first saw this. I am not being, I don’t want to be, I’m not trying to be mean, I am being honest. When I looked at these I thought this looks like a big shed. You were saying that we were the only community that asked that you had any kind of brick. That is a lot of siding on this. When I look at this that’s all the way down to the ground. That is a lot of siding. I’m not sure, when you said that you wanted to make it aesthetically pleasing, I’m not positive that this is going to be authentically pleasing from the street when you are used to seeing more with the brick, with the stone then you see something that’s completely vinyl siding. I have always been a huge supporter of you, you know.

Ms. Gehm: I know.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: I think that you have an awesome, I think this is great, I have always, always been a supporter of independent living and things like that. I think it is an awesome thing that you are doing, I’m just worried about the look of this especially from the street because it looks either shedish or modular homeish.

Ms. Gehm: So, if I had my druthers, the whole building would be brick.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: I am sure. I am positive.

Ms. Gehm: From a maintenance perspective, obviously I am never going to have to replace brick right?

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: Right.

Ms. Gehm: It would be fantastic. I did ask because I understand your concern about the siding. I did ask our architect to take a street scape view with the trees because I think it does change a little bit of its appearance because you don’t see much of the building from the street once the trees are there.
Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: Okay, because I’m feeling this is a lot of siding that you are looking at when you are looking you know.

Ms. Gehm: It is a lot of siding. So, I’ve got a couple of those if you would like to

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: Absolutely, thank you so much.

Ms. Heil: Also, I would just like to add that we do agree that it is a lot of siding but it is a one-story building and I think that if you are looking at it in two dimensions it looks like it is one plane but because of the setback and the overhang in the porch and the shadows and the shading, I think it will not feel like you are looking at a big blank wall of siding.

Ms. Gehm: What is hard to see there is the push back on the front from the porch because it makes it seem very monolithic. One of the other things, I don’t know if this would be amenable the 50% brick is what, I mean that is a lot of brick on a really small budget and while I am already tapped out on budget if there is some way to get a water table amount on the front in part of it. That might be something that I can figure out how to put through my contingency or something like that where I would be able to control that cost a little bit. I actually, because we knew that this would obviously be the hardest thing, we tried to look at what that might look like. So, I can show you that.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: Okay. A lot of pictures.

Ms. Gehm: I know. Good thing I have someone good to draw them.

Ms. Heil: So, that is an option where we have brick up to the underside of the sill of the window which is a very logical spot to stop the brick. We wouldn’t want to just do the math and do 50% brick and then have that be at the two ends that stick out the farthest, farthest to your front and have the base of the columns to help break it up. So, it is not 50%. I feel like it, I think it improves it.

Chairman Darby: Were you finished? Okay

Ms. Heil: We don’t have any more pictures. We are out, we are done with pictures.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Ramirez.

Mr. Ramirez: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I also have concerns. I applaud your efforts in your project and I am for that but myself, I also have concerns with the type of building. When we first spoke of this, we had some residents here objecting to the project to begin with. Some people had concerns about putting it in that location. In looking at this, it is adjacent to two brick homes and I’m trying to think what I would feel like if a large siding type home was next to a home that those homes have been there for 50+ years, how I would feel. We have to respect the residents as well. I think the last two that you sent up are definitely something to look at and going in the right direction. I would not be in favor of that large device with siding at that location. I do think, looking at the right project now, now that you are adding some brick or maybe some stone, something to break it up a little bit and as someone said Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup was talking about it looking like a large shed, I totally agree with that. So, just my comments. Thank you.

Chairman Darby: Before I move on to our next set of questions, Mr. Taylor, bring some clarity to us. I keep hearing a figure of 50% thrown around.

Mr. Taylor: That is a requirement in the Corridor District. It is not a specific requirement of our zoning in general.

Chairman Darby: Okay.

Mr. Taylor: It’s in Subarea D of the Corridor Review District, otherwise we wouldn’t be talking about it. Frankly, I mean it wouldn’t be a, I think it is always going to be an
aesthetic consideration regardless of where you are but the requirement is initiated because of the Corridor Review District, as is the requirement for earth tone colors.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Mr. Bauer.

Mr. Bauer: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Couple of questions. You talked about the two other projects.

Ms. Gehm: Yes.

Mr. Bauer: Is this project tied, the status of those and those proceedings, is this project directly tied to those?

Ms. Gehm: Yes.

Mr. Bauer: If they don’t go, this one doesn’t go in regards to financial aspects?

Ms. Gehm: So, all of them are tied up in the same funding packages. They have all already been awarded except for the last piece where the application window opens in May. They are already part of the same package. If for some reason this didn’t go forward, I’d likely have to let go of all three projects and go back for funding again and it would probably take another five years.

Mr. Bauer: Now are the other two in the same cycle before a Planning Commission?

Ms. Gehm: No, I started this one a lot earlier because it wasn’t already zoned for its intended purpose where the other two were and because of the different zoning requirements we were able to meet all of the zoning requirements. Every one of them right?

Ms. Heil: Yeah.

Ms. Gehm: For both the Werk Road site and the Cottonwood site.

Mr. Bauer: Okay. The $15,000 that you have talked about for brick, is that at 50%?

Ms. Gehm: Not at that level. That’s at the 50% so if we did something smaller like that where I can get it in there for a couple thousand that now I might be able to figure out, you know, either take it from a contingency and hope that I don’t have site cost over runs or something like that.

Mr. Bauer: Okay. Fire protection cost.

Ms. Gehm: Yes.

Mr. Bauer: What is that for one of these residents, average?

Ms. Gehm: They are all the same. So, it is $14,000 per site. So, I am spending about $45,000 across the three sites.

Mr. Okum: Is that commercial or residential?

Ms. Gehm: It is residential code but, and I say that but that is just the sprinkler system itself. It also requires that our taps be significantly bigger and the pipe is significantly bigger so it is even more than that. I believe that it is a 4” tap so it is a very large tap. It is a very large pipe that has a lot more cost associated with it.

Mr. Bauer: Okay. I just wanted to get a feel for that. I guess I too would prefer some more stone or brick. The two houses adjacent to you are brick but if as you go down the street there are houses, obviously older, they are not vinyl siding but they are a siding type material. I have looked at that also so I am not opposed to siding, I would prefer some other material other than all siding. The last thing was in regards to the
site boundaries. Is there a reason that that couldn't, the housing unit couldn't be shifted to the west I guess is where you have more room than to the east, more centered.

Ms. Gehm: It is just the parking.

Mr. Corte: Again my name is Steve Corte with the Kleingers Group. There is a fairly large tree on the west property line and we are trying to salvage as much as we can to avoid having to replace them. So, there is a fairly good buffer, natural existing buffer on the west property line and we would rather not tear that out.

Mr. Bauer: Okay.

Mr. Corte: So, we tried, I mean when I first started looking at this site layout I thought we had plenty of room but we plopped the building on there and parking and it was relatively tight. Especially when we had to fit 23 trees in there and however many shrubs. It got real tight real quick but I think in the end it works pretty well.

Mr. Bauer: Okay. I've got one last question I just thought of and then it went right back out of my mind so I will stop.

Chairman Darby: That will start happening more and more.

Mr. Corte: Can I add one more thing, the buffer issue that Mr. Dale brought up, we misunderstood the zoning map. The parcels weren't shown so we understood the parcel to the east to be zoned business. For what it is worth, Google Maps showed it as a hair salon. Maybe it's not but we understand that we mistook that and it is a residential zone. So, we had shown that 10 foot buffer as Mr. Dale had stated, it was mistaken. So, it should be 20 feet. We have 18 feet. You are correct. We have 18 feet from the east property line to the edge of the parking. If that is a big sticking point we can simply shift the parking lot over two feet and make that work without a big problem. So, if that is a sticking point.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: Thank you Mr. Chairman. The only thing I would mention is that the property owner that came to the last meeting was actually the people that lived to the west as I recall and I think their primary concern was that nothing was going to be behind their house and of course there isn't. But, I think the value of the tree and the existing vegetative buffer is probably significant to those folks. Just wanted to pass that along.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Mr. Hall.

Mr. Hall: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I'd like to say, along with the other commission members I definitely do admire your cause for having it, but I think it is a responsibility of ours to do the best thing for the community. Your associate there said that there was a difference, if I recall correctly $10,000 to $20,000 for brick and coming before the commission this evening you knew that was going to be an issue. Is that correct?

Ms. Gehm: Yeah.

Mr. Hall: Do you have then an estimate in lieu of the siding with the siding being removed what the brick would cost to make it presentable to the other neighbors in the area that you are going to be neighbors with, because I don't feel, or can't support a building like this and do that to the folks that live there. I couldn't do that in good conscience.

Ms. Gehm: So, we knew that it was going to be a sticking issue, didn't realize how much until relatively shortly before the meeting and unfortunately it wasn't enough time for us to go to the general contractor and get a firm price. I'm guessing it would be a couple thousand dollars. Do you think that is reasonable?
Ms. Heil: I think it is more than that.

Ms. Gehm: More than that?

Ms. Heil: The foundations get bigger, so I think you are probably up to 20.

Chairman Darby: We can’t hear you. Would you come to the mic if you are going to please?

Ms. Heil: $15,000 to $20,000 that the general contractor gave use was for 50% of the front elevations which is what is in the code, not around the entire building. Most of that cost is probably increasing the foundations because of the brick and the brick ledge. So, I would say we are at $5,000 or $8,000 to add certain amount of brick. We have not gone back to the contractor and shown them this drawing that we presented to you tonight. That would be our next step.

Mr. Hall: So, what do you base those numbers on then?

Ms. Heil: Just the fact that he said that 50% of the front elevations would be $15,000 to $20,000. I’m just doing the math in my head. I am just intuitively doing the math. We did not have that elevation priced by the contractor before this meeting.

Mr. Hall: Thank you so much for your response. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Okum.

Mr. Okum: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Couple things. Let’s talk building elevation first. That is what I do. So, there’s, one of the problems is if you impose the requirements for masonry or brick front you are faced with two different trades basically handling the front. So you have staging set up in all of the affected areas. There are panels now that are masonry panels that could be used that can be installed by the siding applicator that do not require a brick mason to be staged on the job site. So, you can bring your cost down significantly by not mixing trades and you can have that skilled carpenter or the finisher or finishing person accommodate that by doing it. Azek makes one, Boral makes one. There’s several companies that are doing it that have a masonry façade. That’s not strictly vinyl. I think you have heard from most of the commission, it is going to be a stumbling point so we need to sort of work through that. That being said, I saw on the landscape drawing that there are four huge trees that are proposed to be planted in the back of the parcel around the retention pond. I’m not one to pull trees but I think you have pretty sizeable, you are accommodating our tree preservation ordinance and I think it is within this commission’s prerogative to give relief on some of the landscaping. Now, Mrs. McBride is not here so I can do that and feel pretty good about it so, Greg you promise not to tell? Okay. So, there are some things you can do there. The parking spot that is on the right-hand side that is causing that issue on that 18 foot, our code doesn’t require that you have that spot. If you eliminated that spot you still have nine and you eliminate the concrete, you eliminate the extra curbing that’s required to put that in there. So you are saving some money there that you won’t need and we’re not going to require it. I’m looking, I do a lot of work with people with disabilities so I don’t anticipate that there is going to be a lot of drivers in this building.

Ms. Gehm: It is not the tenants.

Mr. Okum: It’s service people.

Ms. Gehm: Honestly, there is only one time of day that I really suspect that, well three times a day I guess, when I suspect that the parking is going to potentially be an issue and that is at shift changes. So you have someone coming and someone leaving, you’ve got two cars there and that was really why we were trying to go with 10. It gave enough to have a visitor there and have them have a car that can transport someone in a wheelchair on site.
Mr. Okum: No if you are like Mercy at the corner they use the vacant lot around the corner for all of their additional parking.

Ms. Gehm: Oh, I might have to talk to Mercy.

Mr. Okum: Talk to Mercy, they’ve got it worked out. So, going to that I think that you can make some adjustments there and save yourself some money because concrete you know at $10 per square foot, you are talking a parking space at 160 square feet, you get my point?

Ms. Gehm: I do.

Mr. Okum: It brings cost down. Plus a curb that is associated with it so you are going to save the money on the curbing. I too appreciate the cause and the purpose and the need for these facilities to be available to people with disabilities. I’m very strongly a proponent for it, so we want to try to help you get from point A to point B but still be sensitive to our Zoning Code and our Corridor Review District. Now, this property sort of falls right on that edge of our Corridor Review District. I really want to see a map of our Corridor Review District if staff has it because I think, because we have properties that are right on the edge and I think this is one of those edge properties. So, you are familiar with this map? The Corridor Review District basically widened out at that point because that is sort of a gateway into Springdale and this is going to be a gateway location into Springdale and the property behind your or to the east of yours along Springfield Pike has been up for sale for some time and I would anticipate something happening with that property. You may be the catalyst that gets that to go. We also have to realize that you are on the residential side and that is on the commercial side and we are still going to have that business owner, whoever buys that property come to the City of Springdale and say, well you gave relief to.

Ms. Gehm: I understand.

Mr. Okum: If you gave relief to them why didn’t you give it to me and why can’t you give it to me. So, we have to be concerned about that. So, I’m looking at, and I understand and I think you are under valuing or under estimating the cost of that internal sprinkler system, I think it is a significant cost and I think it is much more than $15,000, I think it is more in the $30,000 value unless it is a residential system because I deal with it and it is not cheap especially when you do the head and the lines that you have to have and the connection point for the fire department.

Ms. Gehm: Yes, I didn’t include any of that when I was giving it, I didn’t include the pit or the street costs.

Mr. Okum: Yeah, which are just awful. So, that being said I think we understand that so we need to help you get there. The good thing is you’ve got, like you have the trash container area on the side of the building so that breaks that elevation up some. I’m not really too concerned about it. I think most of the commission is concerned with that front look, the street look and it is a lot easier to defend it if we can get something other than that brought to us. Now, for us to make a motion to bring something forward is going to be tough unless we put a standard that 50% of the front of the building be of a masonry type or stone or brick look, material. Personally, I don’t care if it’s synthetic anymore because I find that the synthetics are holding up as long as some of the other stuff. There’s flexibility in that part. On the gables you could do a vinyl shake to give break. You could do, I’m not trying to architecturally design it, you guys are the architects I’m not, but there are other methods to get to the point to break that elevation up. That being said, I don’t know where else we can go with it. I do have a question in regards to potential cross access to that single family house that’s to the east. There is a great difference between that house and the parking lot of Mercy, I think. I believe there is but maybe there isn’t. We are going to need to try to make sure that that, because we are talking driveway cuts, and Don were we 60 feet from that driveway? Is that right? Is it a 60 foot difference to the first drive in?

Mr. Shvegzda: To the driveway that is to the east?
Mr. Okum: To the single family residence?

Mr. Shvegzda: The driveway that is to the east, yes that is 61 feet I think.

Mr. Okum: Okay, so we do have some distance. I was afraid that they were going to get too close and that would be an issue. I’d like to see cross access but on the other hand I sort of like the trees there better than I like the cross access.

Ms. Gehm: So, the cross access, if you don’t mind me speaking to that just a little bit?

Mr. Okum: Sure.

Ms. Gehm: Part of the concern for us was that many of the individuals that live in our homes will attend a day program and often they are picked up by an accessible vehicle, especially if they are in a mobility accessible home. Stop having an access bus stop on West Sharon Road, it would give me nightmares. I don’t think that that would be feasible. Also, pulling in and then trying to back back out on Sharon, this is what we are talking about right when you say cross access?

Mr. Okum: No, I’m cross access for the adjacent property.

Ms. Gehm: Then forget I said anything.

Mr. Okum: No, I know where you’re at and I totally understand what you are doing and why that purpose because an accessible van needs to get in and they don’t back up well and frankly I don’t want to hear that beeper going off as it is backing up anyway.

Ms. Gehm: I just worried about safety.

Mr. Okum: I don’t think the residents want to hear the beeper backing up. I’d much rather see it go in and go out in a safe way. Going out on the west side, in my opinion, is a much better way than going out on the east side because of its distance from the intersection.

Ms. Gehm: So you are just saying flip the direction?

Mr. Okum: No, I’m fine with the way it is.

Ms. Gehm: Oh, okay.

Mr. Okum: I’m fine with it.

Ms. Gehm: I’m sorry I missed something.

Mr. Okum: My point was that the single family home, sort of that postage stamp lot where that, I guess it is still an occupied home right? Far as we know it is an occupied home. Thinks would be a lot better if that owner would eventually decide to incorporate their home into something else. That may end up being an access drive to the other parcel.

Ms. Gehm: I see.

Mr. Okum: Because of where it is going to be because it is going to be really hard for someone to sell that lot.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Dale.

Mr. Dale: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I’m obviously substituting for Mrs. McBride, I don’t know the code quite as well but the way I read the code for Sub Area D, I just want to point out that 50% requirement appears to apply to at least three sides of the façade.
Mr. Okum: Three sides, I was afraid of that.

Ms. Heil: Do you have that working in front of you?

Mr. Dale: Sure, it says: Fifty percent of at least three facades (excluding windows and doors in the calculation of façade area) and any façade visible from a public right-of-way of the building shall contain brick and/or stone.

Ms. Heil: So, when I read that I was assuming we were talking about, this piece, this piece and the setback piece and then the sides returning back to the recessed piece. Is that how you read that?

Mr. Dale: That is a creative interpretation but no, I don’t think that is how I would interpret that.

Ms. Heil: Well because that is what is facing the street. That is what happened and that was my understanding.

Mr. Dale: But I think it was intended to be three sides.

Mr. Okum: So, based upon that, since I still have the floor, I’m hearing a lot of people that are very supportive to make this happen. I’ve made some suggestions that I would like to hear from the commission in regards to some relief on the tree preservation requirements. Cut back on some of that, especially in the rear lot area because basically you’ve got Baldwin and Baldwin’s driveway on the back side of you and natural vegetation that’s just heavy as heck back there. So, you are going to break up some of it with the detention facility. Definitely we need the detention. I know the owner of the Augustine Consulting business down below and it is soppy in his back yard. So anything that could be done in that area would be appreciated I’m sure. On the other hand, I think we need to do something. If we could give some relief in that area, drop out that one parking space if the commission is in support of that allowing you the nine instead of ten and then on the other hand maybe treat the sides with the skirt and do more on the front that breaks that front up with a different architectural elevation. You know skirt walls on the side, three foot up and two foot six with a water ledge on it and then your vinyl siding and then maybe change your gables out a little bit to give you something more cottage looking instead of, and I think that is sort of the look with the porches you’ve got anyway. You’ve got a cottage look right?

Ms. Heil: Do you mean change the form of the roof? Is that what you are suggesting?

Mr. Okum: No, the gable wall.

Ms. Heil: The finish.

Mr. Okum: The finish. Just change it out to give it something. Utilize some of the natural, the materials that are available that are going to give you the 50.

Ms. Heil: We will definitely talk to the contractor about all kind of construction methods.

Chairman Darby: What I’m hearing from the commission, I know them pretty well is a tremendous willingness to work with you guys. We supported this initiative when you first brought it to us and that’s unwavering. But, as several of the people have said, we have to be concerned about the folks who are there. I think what I am hearing is not a request for a motion but perhaps a request for a continuance. Is that the right word?

Mr. Okum: Yes sir.

Chairman Darby: A continuance so you could bring something back to us and as you work through this just stay in touch with staff because they’ve heard our comments just as you have. Any other comments before.
Mr. Okum: I just want to know if that timing works you’ve got a deadline.

Ms. Gehm: I wanted to look at, the May deadline is just for funding. I don’t need to get, I won’t be breaking ground until this summer.

Mr. Okum: We’d be good to see you in April.

Ms. Heil: So, April 9th and we would just be on the agenda without having to meet the deadline for applications? I thought we missed that already.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Dale.

Mr. Dale: I’m sorry I was just going to ask for a clarification at your direction that staff is hearing what commission is saying. I just want to make sure that we’re clear that in particular the use of some alternative synthetic materials would be potentially acceptable to the commission? Correct, as opposed to true brick and stone?

Mr. Okum: That is correct staff. We’ve got Hardie that we are approving for buildings currently at are cementitious material. We’ve got Azek, we’ve got Borel, there’s a number of materials that can give appearance and compliment and meet the intent of the code.

Ms. Heil: Am I hearing you say that Hardy Plank boards meets the intent of the brick or stone? The cement board siding?

Mr. Okum: No but it meets the siding requirements for, we substitute Hardy in a lot of areas. We have on other parts of the corridor for parts of the building.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: I think, and if I am miss-speaking Dave let me know. Hardy makes panel products that appear to be masonry.

Ms. Heil: That is what I meant.

Mr. Taylor: I don’t think we are talking about just using Hardy siding.

Ms. Heil: No, that’s not what I am saying.

Mr. Taylor: The panel, Hardy makes

Mr. Okum: It would cost you too much to do that building in Hardy.

Ms. Heil: We started out with Hardy.

Ms. Gehm: Yes it would.

Ms. Heil: I understand. You are talking about the Hardy cement board siding panels.

Mr. Taylor: Right.

Ms. Heil: We use them all the time on lots of other projects. My question is, if you are suggesting that that, not Hardy Plank siding but the panels as a replacement for brick?

Mr. Taylor: Yes. That is where I was going with it.

Mr. Okum: Only the brick.

Mr. Taylor: Let me, if I might again. I am not trying to put word into anybody’s mouth but you folks may recall that Nichiha panel that was on the AT&T building which is a different brand but it basically looks like brick and it is a cementitious material. So, I
think in my mind that would satisfy the brick or stone requirement. Is that correct but not a panel?

Mr. Okum: Not a T111 Hardy Panel.

Mr. Taylor: Right.

Ms. Gehm: Obviously we are going to have to go back.

Ms. Heil: We will go back and talk about it. We design buildings with all types of materials so we can go back to our contractor and talk about what the most affordable option is.

Chairman Darby: Are you requesting that we see you again on the 9th?

Mr. Gehm: If you would oblige us.

Chairman Darby: It is a table not a continuance.

Mr. Okum: Based upon the discussion and the request of the applicant I move to table this.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: I second it.

Chairman Darby: It has been moved and second that this be that this be tabled until our next meeting. Secretary please call the roll.

(Secretary called the roll and the motion was approved with a vote of 7-0.)

Chairman Darby: See you next month.

Ms. Heil: May I ask one point of clarification. We talked about the 18 feet and the 20 feet. If the 18 feet is acceptable, we are not going to shift it over and regrade the plan.

Chairman Darby: We don’t see that as an issue.

Mr. Okum: If you drop out that parking space you get, you are more than 20.

Ms. Heil: Correct. If you can deal with it.

Ms. Gehm: That’s fine.

Ms. Heil: Okay. Thank you all.

IX. DISCUSSION

Chairman Darby: Any items for discussion. Mr. Ramirez.

Mr. Ramirez: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Okum spoke of a number of different things there and hopefully the applicant knows what to come back with. We talked about reduction of the driveway space, reduction of the trees. I’m unclear really with what they are going to come back with. I know we need to change the façade and that look but are we also giving leeway to reduce the tree requirement and are we also allowing them to reduce the parking?

Chairman Darby: The parking would be

Mr. Ramirez: It’s not required

Chairman Darby: It’s not required, it would be one space of the ten and there was consideration for reducing the tree requirement.
Mr. Ramirez: Are we saying yes when they come back?
Chairman Darby: Straw poll, I’m saying yes. Straw poll says yes.

Mr. Ramirez: Thank you.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Okum.

Mr. Okum: Just getting back to what Mr. Hawkins brought forward in regards to commercial vehicles parked in driveways and on streets. This body is responsible for the thoroughfare plan for the city as well as the zoning recommendations to the city regarding the zoning code. Thoroughfare plan is a little bit more complicated because it is a public safety issue with the police and vehicles and what the police have to deal with more than this body does. Yeah, the width of roads and where the roads are going to be constructed and so forth and subdivision regulations under that, those all fall under us. When it comes to the properties and commercial vehicles parked in yards, it is no different than SUVs parked in yards, boats parked in yards all the same things. I’ve got a company car, if I had a sign on a company car am I a commercial vehicle?

Chairman Darby: Put it in your driveway.

Mr. Okum: Put it in my driveway and there’s discussion. I think that that is something that possibly needs to be looked at more and more it becomes more of a thing. How many places do you drive and you see one of these trucks that serve food? The hot wagon trucks or meals on wheels type of things. But there is a lot of people that drive, a guy makes deliveries in his pick-up truck that is a commercial vehicle. Is that going to be considered a restriction in our zoning code?

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: It already is.

Mr. Okum: Only if it is labeled and it is identified as a commercial vehicle and it is over three tons or something.

Chairman Darby: Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: And if it has ladders on the top things like this. There was a big concern and absolutely with merit was that right now you can go get a family van, like a cargo van and it is actually, you can’t park it in your own driveway because it is beyond our restrictions right now as far as the height and the width. That is just for your regular cargo van. If I wanted a van at my house, if I got a full size van I can’t because they make them too big now or whatever. I wouldn’t be allowed to park them in my own driveway just for residential if it is a commercial I wouldn’t be able to put that in my driveway either because again it is too wide and too big and that is just for a normal sized van. My concern wasn’t about one person, like if you had a truck or a van that’s commercial, if you park that on the street. One, I really wasn’t that concerned about but there are some people who run their businesses out of their home. Like there is a plumbing company down by my house and they have three or four vans and a truck that gets dropped off every day and they take up all of Van Cleve. So, if you are going to go park there you can’t and Van Cleve is already the smallest, narrowest street in all of the world so it is very hard to get through. On Mangrove where my parents live next door to them, they recently moved out but there was a man who had a landscape business and they had all of their landscape trucks. They didn’t have the back on it, it was just a regular pickup truck but it had the name on the side of it and they parked those three or four trucks and that took up pretty much all of Mangrove Lane. Those are the concerns. My personal belief is that if you are going to park it in your driveway, if it is a normal sized van the way that they make them now, it is kind of hard because, like I said even a personal van by our code right now can’t be parked in your own driveway because it doesn’t meet code. It is too big.

Mr. Okum: Really?
Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: Yes. We actually had examples of it. I wish I would have brought it tonight, we had a sheet that the city had looked up and did the work for us and it had about four or five different vans, one of which I think someone on our City Council actually has that van, they have a child with special needs. They have a bigger van for that and they said that by the code they really can’t even park their van in their own driveway.

Mr. Okum: So the enforcement of it, if it is in the driveway, falls under our Building Department.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: Correct.

Mr. Okum: Or zoning department

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: Yeah.

Mr. Okum: The police action is for vehicles on the street?

Mr. Hall: Correct.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: Correct. I guess it would be up to if I called Gregg and said, Hey there’s these cars here. If no one is going to report somebody who’s parked in the driveway or if they are I guess that’s, or when you guys are doing the drive around would you look? Would you necessarily get out of the car and measure a van that is in a driveway? I don’t know exactly how that works.

Mr. Taylor: Typically we wouldn’t measure it. We do routinely patrol the residential areas and I would say that it is somewhat of a judgement call to the guys that are out there whether something is blatantly commercial or not. Typically, and where this really becomes an increasing challenge, many many many people have vehicles that, were they not identified as a commercial use, more and more people have SUVs, pickup truck, vans or whatnot and I have a pickup truck in my driveway and it doesn’t have any identification on it and my next door neighbor has the exact same truck but it says “Joe’s Carpentry” on it and he’s not allowed to park. So I think these are some of the challenges that we are trying to deal with. The other issue of course is the other sorts of vehicles. Trailers and we try to make a distinction in the code whether it’s a trailer for recreational use, well I have been told everything in the world is my recreational use and I’m pretty hard pressed to do anything about that to be honest with you. I think, personally, I think this is a real key issue that really kind of goes hand in hand with the whole planning initiative that I think we need to make as a city and I think I am going to use this opportunity as my commercial for, please let’s get together as soon as we possibly can, and I know there is a, there has been at least some discussion about Hamilton County leading us in a couple of meetings and we were hoping for them to be in April with the leadership of the city to discuss a variety of issues. Most of them were, frankly, were more planning related but this is really, this is germane to the question because it really addresses who we are and what we want to look like and where we are going. It’s really very difficult to write a one size fits all code, especially when we don’t know exactly it is that we are trying to accomplish. So, I would add my staff’s confusion I guess if you will in trying to deal with this problem because it really is challenging. Between, recreational vehicles, boats, trailers, commercial vehicles, I mean these are all real sensitive issues and again as our, I think as people have more and more disposable income, we seem to have more and more toys, vehicles, whatnot and then we have the other issue of I think there is a significant amount of people working in the building trades for example or some other thing that they identify their business by their truck. Well okay, it’s a commercial vehicle all of a sudden. We’ve had a number of phone calls. Fortunately, some of them we can shed to the P.D. because it is regarding vehicles parked on the street. It is a real issue and any guidance would be greatly appreciated.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Hawkins.
Mr. Hawkins: Thank you Mr. Chairman. This is not inherently something that Planning Commission has to come through with a thought or decision this evening but in all seriousness, the input is helpful and Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup and I, primarily her, because she will do the report, will take that information back from Planning Commission. So, it is something that we would implore you to think about and as we come back in April, folks would have had some more time to think about it, we could have some more discussion just in terms of some of the thoughts, concerns, that folks may have in terms of commercial vehicles, whether they are parked in the driveway or parked on the street, as well as other larger SUVs, trucks, vans what have you and if it is something that we should give some additional consideration to looking at in the code in terms of expanding the size of those vehicles.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Mr. Okum.

Mr. Okum: Just, in my opinion, zoning is pretty simple, it is mass and the effects on how it impacts neighborhoods. So, if you think of mass, the size of the vehicle or the size of the element, whatever it is in the driveway, is what you are really talking about. It is not whether it is an SUV, an RV or recreational vehicle or a boat or 10 boats, it is the mass of items on that property and how that impacts that neighborhood.

Chairman Darby: How’s a sign figure into that?

Mr. Okum: As sign, I don’t get into signs on that. Oh the sign on it?

Chairman Darby: Yeah.

Mr. Okum: It doesn’t matter. It may not be something you like. I’m just saying a sign may be something you don’t like but whether I have a sign in the back window of my car that’s “Dave’s Remodeling” or whatever or I have a sign on the door that says “Joe’s Carpentry”, it doesn’t really matter. What matters is that how that mass, those vehicles, those devices, whatever they are, whether they be a trailer that you pull behind your car or it is a hopped up SUV or it is one of those big food trucks, that is what you are being impacted by. We could be say it could be painted rainbow colors. Are we going to start saying we can’t have them painted rainbow colors? We really can’t, can we? It gets pretty crazy. I think when we look at the, at least in my perspective, I look at how mass impacts residences and neighbors and that’s the most important thing. Once you get the mass addressed then you can deal with whatever it is, it doesn’t matter what it is. It is just that property is designed to handle that much. We did it with the sheds. For almost 30 years this city had a shed regulation in the City of Springdale that said you had a 10x12 shed no matter what size your property was. How silly that was. It really didn’t make any sense because basically everybody has a different foot print, a different postage stamp or a different area that they could put their shed in. So, we addressed it by how much the shed could be based upon the property size, the size of the house. Is it still working Gregg? Do we get shed applications?

Mr. Taylor: For the most part, I don’t think we have any issue with, I mean occasionally we’ll have to bring something to the BZA.

Mr. Okum: We literally at BZA had a shed application for variance every meeting, if it wasn’t every meeting it was two in a meeting for years and it was a nightmare. It was just crazy and Gregg would go crazy. You’d go crazy because we were basically amending our zoning code by approving all of these things that didn’t conform. Anyway, I’ve been on my soapbox enough. Thanks.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Bauer.

Mr. Bauer: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I echo Mr. Okum’s comments. Mass could be the big concern. I get a little concerned, I work in an industry, construction industry that folks that becomes their personal vehicle, their commercial vehicle, their way to and from work. They need to have it at home, if they need it the next day. The don’t have the opportunity to go to a shop to get it. That’s just their way of life. I guess personally
it bothers me that we try to restrict people’ livelihoods there. It is just their way of life and the mass seems to be a good way but even in that regard, I personally I don’t have a big issue with people and what they put in their drive unless it’s not well taken care of and an RV I guess gets to mass and that gets to be too big. Again, personal liberties and I have a hard time with that subject. Thank you.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: As an interesting aside, and this really relates to the mass question because we have at least weekly and probably more frequently, how many cars can a person have? How many? I mean there is no requirement on the number of cars a person can have, yet from a mass stand point I mean it can have a significant impact. A person has a one car garage that is full of other than vehicles and a narrow one car driveway and they have four vehicles, where are they going to go? So, you have a couple in the driveway and a couple on the street and pretty soon it has an impact on the neighborhood. We have no way of addressing that at the moment. These are really serious questions at least from our perspective in the enforcement realm, it is very serious. Of course they are all related as the more popular variance granting and essentially rewriting the zoning code. I don’t know how many garage conversions were approved. That has a real impact on the neighborhood because all of a sudden there’s no place to put that car and then we have somebody, my garage has been converted so now I need a shed. So then we have a shed and they still don’t have any place to park the car and, oh by the way I have a boat and it just goes on and on and on. So, good luck writing that Council, good luck to you.

Chairman Darby: Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: Thank you Mr. Chairman. As a person who is getting ready to have four drivers in the house, luckily I have a double driveway, my house does have a converted garage long before I moved in there, didn’t realize the impact that it would have on my life when I first bought the house. The first winter I figured it out. BZA, I was like, NO, you don’t want to convert it! My problem, I have no problem with commercial vehicles being at people’s homes if it is one. We have, especially in our neighborhood, I don’t know if other neighborhoods are like this because I drive through mine. I park in mine so I see it every day. We have quite a few people who own businesses out of their home and they have lots of cars and lots of trucks. On my street we have one of those 24/7 AAA Jeeps. They have five of them and none of them are ever parked in the driveway except for during the day. At night they are all on the street. So, that takes up a big amount of the street parking, we are one sided street parking. In the driveway, I have to agree if you want to park your commercial truck, I don’t see a problem with it in your driveway. The problem is that the size of it. If it has ladders on top right now, that is against the rules. I don’t see a problem with it, if you want to have ladders or if you need to have ladders on your truck, that’s your livelihood, I think you should be able to park that in your driveway. If you own a company and you have six of those, and they are parked on the entire street and no one else can park there, that is where the problem is. If you allow one do you have to allow six? There needs to be something that limits it without being unreasonable. I think that’s going to be the thing is trying to really balance that reasonable and unreasonable amount of who can park what where and not affect their livelihood.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: Regarding home occupations. Sometimes we don’t, because we are here from 8am-5pm, we don’t really know what is going on. So, I would encourage you, sometime either after the meeting call me, do something. Let me know because part of our home occupation ordinance or rules, you are not allowed to dispatch employees. In other words, you are not supposed to have half a dozen trucks sitting in the street because these people are not supposed to be coming to their house and leaving out of the house. So, let me just say, you might want to let us know where that’s going on.

Chairman Darby: You want to live with restriction, have an H.O.A. and you can’t even park on the street overnight. Mr. Hall.
Mr. Hall: Thank you Mr. Chairman. This is strictly just a comment because this is a very very complex problem. As the Chairman indicated if you have an H.O.A. you deal with that. With the City with a problem just to add to the mix, if you had “Joe’s Carpentry Service” and I had my $350,000 home and my lawn was just well manicured and he decided that he didn’t want to park his van in front of his house, he wanted to park it at my house and move it so it was in concurrence with the City Ordinance that was moved and not a parking violation, that would be problematic. But there is not a tool to enforce that. So, the problem is very very complicated and I’m not sure what type of an enforcement type of tool that you could use or it’s going to have to be well thought out from other municipalities. Maybe a conglomerate of it or something because there is so many variables that are involved in this whole perspective that it needs to be well thought out. Thank you.

Chairman Darby: Thank you.

Mr. Okum: Can I? In closing, a segway to that. That’s one of the purposes of the Planning Partnership and Springdale is a member of it. Anne participates in it.

(Someone talking off mic. not audible.)

Mr. Okum: That’s exactly right and that is what they are there for. We pay a fee to be a member of the Planning Partnership and we need to use that to our advantage.

Chairman Darby: We can get information from municipalities who have comprehensive plans?

Mr. Okum: Yeah.

Chairman Darby: Wow.

Mr. Okum: Yeah, we can get all kinds of ideas. I’m not only in Hamilton County if you want. Saying that, just a reminder that March 22 is the Hamilton County Planning Partnership meeting and it is at Blue Ash again and I don’t know who is going. I’ll be there because I’m on the Regional Planning Commission but I would encourage that if there is money available for a couple of you to attend it is worthy of going to. Greg you are going to be there?

Mr. Dale: I will be there.

Mr. Okum: That’s great.

Mr. Hall: Thank you.

Mr. Okum: Looking forward to seeing whomever is there. Do we have money in the budget for?

Mr. Taylor: Probably not.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: Just you.

Mr. Okum: You don’t have to pay for me, I get in for free. It would be great for you guys to be there. Looking and trying to talk to other people. The best thing in the world is to get to those meetings and talk to other people in other communities. We are not an island. We are all in part of this region here that has similar situations. Springdale is no different, I can’t say it specifically, but Springdale’s not any different that Anderson Township or Forest Park or Woodlawn. We all have the same, we all have neighborhoods and we all have issues and we all have people parking where they shouldn’t park and we all have H.O.A.s and we are all the same. Just a big bushel basket of people.

Chairman Darby: Thank you all. I think this has been some very helpful discussion.
X. CHAIRMAN’S REPORT

None.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Darby: Motion for adjournment?

Mr. Hawkins: So moved.

Mr. Hall: Second.

Chairman Darby: Moved and second, we are adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

_________________________________________ 2019
Don Darby, Chairman
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Richard Bauer, Secretary