

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
November 13, 2018  
7:00 P.M.

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, Richard Bauer, Lawrence Hawkins III, Meghan Sullivan-Wisecup, Tom Hall, Joe Ramirez, Don Darby

Staff Present: Anne McBride, City Planner, Don Shvegza, City Engineer; Gregg Taylor, Building Official

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

IV. MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF OCTOBER 16, 2018

Chairman Darby: The chair will accept the motion to adopt the minutes of our previous meeting.

Mr. Okum: Move to adopt.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: Second.

Chairman Darby: It has been moved and seconded that the minutes of the October 9<sup>th</sup> meeting be adopted.

(Voice vote taken and the minutes were adopted with a vote of 7 to 0.)

V. REPORT ON COUNCIL

Chairman Darby: Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Hawkins: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Council met on October 17<sup>th</sup> of this year. All seven members were present. We had before us Ordinance No. 46-2018 amending the zoning code and the zoning map of the City of Springdale, Ohio to provide for the rezoning of approximately 13.316 acres located adjacent to the north east corner of West Kemper Road and Rose Lane from Residential Single Household-Low Density to Planned Unit Development which is the Springrose subdivision. This was the first reading of that matter. We also had Ordinance No. 47-2018 approving the preliminary development plan of the approximately 13.316 acres located adjacent to the north east corner of West Kemper Road and Rose Lane, again the Springrose subdivision. That was also the first reading. We had Ordinance No. 48-2018 amending Ordinance No. 50-2018 to amend the pay grade of the Assistant to the City Administrator and the Public Health Commissioner and declaring an emergency. That matter passed with 7 affirmative votes. We had Ordinance No. 49-2018 authorizing the Mayor and Clerk of Council/Finance Director to enter into a contract with Justin Bartlett to serve as the Mayor's Court Magistrate for the City of Springdale and declaring an emergency. That passed with 7 affirmative votes. We had Ordinance No. 50-2018 authorizing the Mayor and Clerk of Council/Finance Director to enter into a contract with Seth Tieger for prosecuting services for the City of Springdale, Ohio and declaring an emergency. That also passed with 7 affirmative votes. We had Ordinance No. 51-2018 authorizing the Mayor and Clerk of Council/Finance Director to enter into a contract with Dayrle C. Tibbs for Public Defender services for the City of Springdale, Ohio and declaring an emergency. That matter passed with 6 affirmative votes and 1 dissenting vote. With regard to Council we also met on November 7<sup>th</sup> of his year. All seven members were present. We had before us Ordinance No. 46-2018 in a public hearing amending the

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
13 NOVEMBER 2018

PAGE 2

zoning code and zoning map of the City of Springdale, Ohio to provide for the rezoning of approximately 13.316 acres located adjacent to the north east corner of West Kemper Road and Rose Lane from Residential Single Household Low-Density to a Planned Unit Development, Springrose subdivision. We also had, in conjunction with that in a public hearing Ordinance No. 47-2018 approving the preliminary development plan of the approximately 13.316 acres located adjacent to the north east corner of West Kemper Road and Rose Lane. Both of those passed with 7 affirmative votes. There was a significant turn out with regard to residents that came out and spoke with regard to that situation and addressed Council. It was, that meeting was much easier based on what the Administration as well as Planning Commission had done with regard to that situation. So, that is greatly appreciated what this commission did in terms of getting that situation ready for Council. We also had Ordinance No. 52-2018 providing for the issuance of not to exceed \$1,320,000 real-estate acquisition bond anticipation notes 2018 renewal by the City of Springdale, Ohio in anticipation of the issuance of bonds providing for the pledge of revenues for the payment of such notes and declaring an emergency. That passed with a 7-0 vote. It is also important to note that we had fewer people at Council than we did for the Planning Commission meetings which again I think is because of what Planning Commission did in addressing that situation so it is greatly appreciated.

Chairman Darby: We strive to make things easier you guys.

Mr. Hawkins: We appreciate it. Thank you. That concludes my report unless Mrs. Meghan Sullivan-Wisecup has anything to add or there are any questions.

Chairman Darby: Thank you for that very comprehensive report.

VI. CORRESPONDENCE

None.

VII. OLD BUSINESS

- A. Klusty Sign Associates, Inc., Take 5 Oil Change, 1190 East Kemper Road, Springdale, Ohio Modified PUD Plan (Application 34205)

Chairman Darby: Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: Thank you Mr. Chairman. This is the site you all are familiar with is as this case was before us previously. It's the building that is adjacent to the Mike's Carwash site. The request is for some new signage for the new proprietor or the new ownership I guess. This site plan just indicates what the intention is here and where these different signs are located. This is a rendering of the new proposal and there are some important things to consider here based on the input that you all provided last time around. Most notably the brick is not intended to be painted anymore and the red strip has been reduced to 10% of the façade of the building. This shows the south elevation. That is the east elevation and which shows the Take 5 oil cans which are the subject of part of this discussion because those are cabinet signs. Then this is at the rear of the building and the "You stay in your car" are in fact raised letters they are not painted or anything like that. So, they are not illuminated but again this would be generally in conformance with our code. That is about all I have on this one.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Mrs. McBride.

Mrs. McBride: Thank you. Mr. Taylor took all of my verbiage I think. As the commission knows you tabled this matter at the applicant's request at the October 9<sup>th</sup> meeting and as Mr. Taylor indicated they have decided not to paint the building which is really good. They have reduced the amount of the red band per the discussion with Planning Commission to just 10% of the building. They, I believe have color samples for the commission to look at this evening. The signage that they are requesting is the same as

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
13 NOVEMBER 2018

PAGE 3

what we talked about in October and that was on the three sides of the building similar to what is on the building today, there is signage on all three of those elevations. One correction that I do have is that there was a typo on our report, it is actually 138 square feet of sign area that they are proposing which is still below what they are permitted, I'm sorry it is a little bit over what they are permitted to have. So, at any rate that's all conforming with what I think the commission was looking for last month.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Shvezda do you have anything for us?

Mr. Shvezda: No comments.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Would you like to come forward please?

Mrs. Vergenz: Good evening, I'm Melody Vergenz with Klusty Sign Associates. I did bring you color samples like we talked about last month. (walked away from the mic. not audible) Take 5 has reduced the red band down to the suggested 10% of the height of the building. The building is 210 inches tall and the red band is 21 inches and then the cream color will be top and bottom of that band. So, we feel like they have taken the City's recommendations into consideration and they are more than willing to do that. The brick will not be painted so the building will still conform with the Mike's Car Wash that it is attached to. Other than that, we are still asking for signage on all three elevations of the building. There is signage on all three elevations of the building now and it has been there since the beginning when they opened this business. We are asking for a little bit less square footage than is there now, like 29 square feet less than what is existing. Still a little bit over, I think 24 square feet over what the City says we are allowed but 29 less than what is there now. Then we are asking for the Oil can logos which according to the city, no single face sign cabinets are permitted and they are single face cabinets but they are their corporate identity and it is not real possible to make them any other way.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Not seeing any lights at this time. Mr. Okum.

Mr. Okum: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much for taking the comments from the commission and take them back to Take 5. I appreciate that and I think the city does to. It is certainly a major improvement and a very classy looking presentation. So, I'll be voting in favor of this request.

Mrs. Vergenz: Thank you.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Hawkins: Thank you Mr. Chairman. You indicated, and I just wanted the record to be clear that the oil can that is on there is something that is a corporate logo.

Mrs. Vergenz: Yes.

Mr. Hawkins: That all of the locations have the same thing?

Mrs. Vergenz: Yes, they do.

Mr. Hawkins: Okay.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Okum.

Mr. Okum: Seeing there's no other lights Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move to approve the following project, Take 5 Oil Change at 1190 East Kemper Road, case number 34205 per the specifications and designs provided in our meeting packet as exhibits which were submitted by the applicant and reviewed by staff prior to the meeting including the color pallet samples that were presented this evening.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: I second.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
13 NOVEMBER 2018

PAGE 4

Chairman Darby: It has been moved and seconded that this application be approved as identified by the motion. Secretary please call the roll.

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

Chairman Darby: Welcome.

Mrs. Vergenz: Thank you.

Chairman Darby: Don't be disappointed that we didn't keep you longer this evening.

Mrs. Vergenz: This was much easier.

- B. SCP Springdale, 12110 Princeton Pike, Springdale, Ohio, Final Development Plan, Phase 1 Packet 2, Buildings 2 & 3 (Application 34084)

Chairman Darby: Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: Thank you Mr. Chairman. This is package number 2 of phase 1 of this project. Package one was the mass excavation piece that you all approved recently. This is actually the final development portion of the project for buildings 2 and building 3. This is the aerial of the site. Again, not exactly new news to you folks. The preliminary plan was approved in April by Council. The mass ex plan, final portion of that plan, package one that I referred to earlier was passed by you guys in September. This is a view of the overall plan and you can see building 2 is kind of in the top middle and building 3 is on the top right. So those are the two buildings that are in question tonight. This is the grading plan for building 2, of course you all have this stuff in your packet, I am just kind of going through this just an introduction. This is the landscaping plan for building 2. There are comments on both of these from Mrs. McBride and Mr. Shvezda. This is a rendering of the building and again you have the elevations in your packet, I just put this in for information purposes. This is the site grading plan for building 3, which you will recall is substantially below the Crescentville Road grade and substantially above the property to the south. I included this because there's some comments regarding truck movements and so forth and again this is in your packet. It is called the site turning movement plan and shows how the vehicles would be getting in and out of the site. This is the landscaping plan, and then finally the rendering of building 3. You can see the truck docks to the front that would be facing Crescentville Road and the corner in the foreground is kind of at the corner of the building on the new public street and Crescentville. That is all I have. Thank you.

Chairman Darby: Mrs. McBride.

Mrs. McBride: Thank you. So we reviewed these, it was two separate sites. So, starting with building 2. We looked at the lot area, the percentage of open space, the amount of square footage, the building setbacks, the parking setbacks as it complied with the preliminary development plan that was approved by Planning Commission and City Council. All of those comply with the provisions of those approvals. With regards to parking, the 207,200 square foot building contains 10,360 square feet of office use and another 196,840 square feet of warehouse use. That requires a total of 232 parking spaces by our zoning code. As of right per our code you can take a 10% reduction in the number of parking spaces that are required which takes it down to 208 parking spaces that would be required for the development as presented. The applicant is proposing 195 parking spaces. To approve an additional decrease in the amount of parking we would need either a parking study or an alternative parking option as is required by our code. Additionally I would suggest that any increase in the office area which requires additional parking, more parking than the warehouse space would have to come back to Planning Commission because that would make it not in conformance with any approval that the Planning Commission might give contingent on this parking study or alternative parking methods. We did not receive any information with regards to the ground mounted sign for building 2 or for the wall mounted signage for building 2 or for the development sign which was to occur in the north east corner of this site. The

approvals, however; on the preliminary development plan for this development did tie down the signage very specifically if you'll recall in terms of the number of signs, the height of the signs, the area of the signs, the type of base they had to go onto, the landscape bed and so forth. So, if the commission felt that it was appropriate, that is something that staff could act upon separately. Again, based on the fact that they would need to meet the criteria that the commission and the Council adopted. We had a few comments on the landscape plans. Some of the more poignant ones had to do with the installation of foundation plantings. You have a building that size, staff feels that they need to have some plantings around the base of the building. We also have asked that material other than just seed be planted on that hillside slope coming down from Crescentville. We have some concerns about stability of that hillside and then some other minor details that need be cleaned up on the landscape plan. The lighting plan when the applicant was here initially they agreed to be in conformance with our zoning code lighting requirements which has a maximum mounting height of 15 feet for light fixtures. The plan that come in shows on building 2 wall packs mounted at 30 feet and 8 feet in height. I have looked at the photometric plan, I've had other people in my office look at the photometric plan and I don't think that it is correct. The hot spots that are under those fixtures don't exist, they are like 1.2 foot candles or something like right directly under the fixtures. So, I'd like the applicant to take a look at that because I don't think that the plan is correct. With regards to waste we have asked for and have not received any details as to how waste would be handled on the site, whether it would be an internal compactor or if it is going to be external dumpsters that would require screening per our code. We are in the process, I understand of receiving the recorded copy of the Covenants for this project. We did receive building elevations which are in your packets of the largely conform with the requirements that we have for non-residential PUD building design standards. We have asked for color and material samples for the commission's review and approval here this evening. We did not, however; receive any information on how those mechanical equipment are going to be screened and obviously that has been a concern both by staff and I think the commission from the beginning given the proximity of the building setting from Crescentville. What are we going to see from Crescentville? So those are the comments on building 2. Building 3 in a similar fashion, we looked at the lot area, the open space, the building area, the setbacks for the building, the setbacks for the parking for building 3 and they all comply with what was shown on the preliminary development plan. With regards to parking, that building has 369,600 square feet of area, 18,480 square feet of that is to be used for office and another 351,120 square feet is to be used for warehouse. Based on our code that would require a total of 413 parking spaces. Again, with the 10% reduction that you are permitted to take, they would be required to have 372 parking spaces and they are showing 345 parking spaces. So, in a similar fashion they will need to do a parking study or provide alternative parking. We would also suggest that any increase in the office area will have to come back to Planning Commission for review because again it will not be in conformance with the parking requirements. We did not receive any information for either the ground mounted sign or any wall mounted signage that is to go on building 3 but again the standards were set very clear in the preliminary approval so, if the commission feels appropriate then staff could review that. Similar comments on the landscape plan. Again, on the slope coming down from Crescentville, some type of plant material other than just seeding it. We also have had a question about an existing fence on Crescentville. That comment also applied to building 2. We have some concerns about the site triangle coming out of the north loading dock access road and I think Mr. Shvezda may comment on that as well relative to site distance and propose trees that are there. Those trees are also proposed to be in a future utility easement so we think that there needs to be some modifications made to the landscape plan. Again, similar comments on the lighting plan. The applicant agreed to the 15 foot mounting height on building 3, however; we actually have fixtures on poles that are mounted at 30 feet. We also have wall packs on the east side of the building mounted at 30 feet which is facing residential. So, staff feels very strongly that that needs to be revised and also that that photometric plan which is all on one photometric sheet, both of the buildings, is not correct. So, we would like to see exactly how they come up with the light levels that they are showing on that plan. Again, we did not see anything as to how waste is going to be handled for this site, is it an internal compactor, is it external dumpsters. We don't know. The building design, again, largely conforms to the requirements for the non-residential PUD would

require approval obviously by this commission and we have asked for building material and color samples for your review. Again, we did not receive anything on the screening of mechanical equipment and again this building sits down even lower so you are going to see more of that so we have had a concern on that. Those are my comments.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Shvezda.

Mr. Shvezda: Thank you Mr. Chairman. On building, this actually applies to both buildings 2 and 3. There was a discussion, I think Mr. Taylor had mentioned about the truck turning movements in and out of the driveways for the proposed buildings. Information was supplied based on the WB67 truck, the wheel path for that and it does show that the vehicles can maneuver in and out of the driveways but just barely. There is zero extra tolerance there beyond the wheel path to the edge of the apron. So, based on some concerns that we have had in the past we'll recommend that those widths be increased by five feet at those zero tolerance areas. Then, along with that, as far as the plans, they need to show the detailed dimensions of the aprons such that those can be readily checked when they are constructed in the field. On building 2 on the west truck dock area, there is about a 600 foot length of area where there is no curb at the edge of the pavement. The intent was that that whole area sheet flow off to the west and down into the drainage channel that is in that vicinity, however; there is also proposed a continuous line of landscaping with mulch bed that is in that area, that whole 600 foot length. Noting that this is important landscape area to buffer the end of the loading dock, it will have to have a curb in that location to protect that landscape area. Alternate means to drain that area will need to be determined. Curb ramps will need to be installed for all of the curb ramps that are at the driveways ADA compliant. As far as detailed information for the drainage structures, we need specific information as to what type of ODOT headwall is to be included. Right now it just notes ODOT. If we had the different submissions on the drainage package we will need one packet that has all of the information submitted so that we can have that as a consistent basis to go with the plans. We have been kind of working through a lot of this as we have gone through the plan reviews. On the north and west side of or portion of the site for building 2 the major storm routing is over land in those locations. So, basically it tiers down into like a low spot in each level of the parking lot as it goes from one catch basin of pooled area to the next one. At this point the plans note that in the car parking area there would be up to nine inches of pooled water in that area. We would recommend that that would be limited to a maximum of six inches. On the corner of the, I guess it would be the northwest corner of that building number two there is a headwall there and it's critical that it kind of flows out into the parking lot and down into the area that we talked about before as far as draining into the water course. In particular when that is constructed that will be very valuable piece of information as far as the as-builts to determine that it is constructed correctly so that we know that there is no issue with the headwater for that culvert entrance as far as the effect on the building. So, we will need that information as far as the as-built. Obviously for erosion and sediment control we will have to have all of the measures notes for building 2 specifically in the mass excavation plans in general prior to the start of building 2. All storm water management features, but specifically the detention basin need to be constructed and operational prior to the start of building 2. The storm water pollution prevention plan has been prepared for the overall mass grading work and there will have to be a separate version of that for each building site as we move along. For building 3, as I mentioned, we had the same issue there for the aprons and the truck turning templates so again there is the matter of providing five feet additional width there at the areas where there is zero tolerance for the wheel path. On the north side of the, excuse me the south side of the north driveway on building 3, there is, I assume a modular wall proposed that is about 4.3 feet in height and approximately 55 feet wide. It is noted that the detail design will be provided at a later date, however; we do need to know the basic information as to the manufacture type and color so we know about what it is going to look like. If there is some minor details that are tweaked as the final design is submitted we can look at that as far as the staff level. The north driveway profile, it's been adjusted so that now there is no areas where there is a break in grade that is too excessive. One of the ways that was accomplished was by reversing the apron slope as opposed to being from the right-of-way to the roadway it is now from the back of curb back into the site which eliminates that excessive grade brake, however; we are concerned that we have

enough storm drainage to the pavement that it may over top the depressed curb and flow down into the driveway so with that in mind an additional catch basin needs to be added up hill from the northern driveway. I think Mrs. McBride mentioned the trees that were located to the south of the north truck exit, again that is a site distance issue that needs to be reviewed and adjusted accordingly in addition to the fact that they are planting in what is noted to be a future utility easement. Again, as far as the major storm routing we have the same situation where we do have up to nine inches in the car area. Again, we recommend that it be limited to six inches and adjusted accordingly. Same issues as far as, same comments in regards to the provisions to the erosion and sediment control and storm water pollution prevention plan. That concludes my comments.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Does the applicant want to come forward?

Mr. Cumming: Good evening I'm John Cumming with Strategic Capital Partners.

Chairman Darby: Good evening.

Mr. Cumming: We are pleased to be here, kind of on the next step of our plans and approvals here and with regard to the final building plans. We look forward to answering and providing any comments that we can in terms of some of the questions that staff had raised and questions that you may have. With me tonight is Paul Meijer of JRA Architecture and David Wright of Kleingers Group. Paul will assist me in answering questions and comments regarding the building architecture and Dave will help me answer questions and comments regarding any civil aspects of the comments that you have heard. So, with any luck here, and I am going to avoid being too repetitive. A lot of these slides you have just seen, you have seen some of them before and some you have just seen. So, I will push past them and really arrange this so that we are handling building 2 first and then building 3 second. So, we will just move forward with that and as I said on some of these that are too repetitive I will keep moving and we will circle back and try to answer questions and comments. This is building 2, this is just a rendering that we have done that shows kind of a real world elevation of the building looking from the north east to the south west from Crescentville as to what that building would look like given the real world elevations and landscaping to that building. Building 2 site plan, again this is fairly repetitive. This is the floor plan of the building itself showing the dimensions and the bay depths and column widths. This is the auto turn analysis that we have done as part of our package. Landscaping plan, plant schedule, obviously hard to see anything there but that is included in the package. Utility plan same thing. Building elevations, you have a color elevation here showing the location of doors, windows, entrances into building 2. This is a black and white elevation of building 2 also with just a bit more detail. Site lines to the building, we will address those especially as it relates to the comment about mechanical equipment on the roof of the buildings. So, that is really it on building 2. So, I will start back here and refer to the comments from staff here that we just heard. Some of these, I guess, responses will apply to both buildings but I'll try to tackle them as we go here. With regard to the auto turn analysis that was, and staff was looking for some additional pavement because we were kind of at a zero tolerance pavement width on the turns for the trucks, we can add that 5 feet of width on the pavement so we will commit to do that to provide some extra tolerance for the turn trucking on those turns and applies to both buildings two and three. With regard to the curb, there's a comment on the curb on the west side of building two or lack thereof a curb on the west side of building two. We will commit to add that curb in response to staff's comments about drainage and along that side. Please, when I am skipping, I am sure we can circle back if I'm missing some comments here. With regard to landscaping, the comment about the foundation planting at the building, we will add that foundation plantings at the base of the building. We will work with staff with that on the scope the landscaping planting. I'll let Dave speak to storm water management issues. With regard to parking, I guess our plan there is that knowing that this building is a speculative building, not knowing today what the office space amount will be, we've kind of just used a percentage of the total building and I think we've calculated 5% office space as an estimate as to what the total office space would be for the building. So, what our I guess our response and that would be that once we land a tenant or tenants

for the building and we understand we'd know what their parking requirements are, we have their office plans, we are going to need to come back in for permits to build the office space for those tenants. We will know how much office space is needed based on those tenants and how much office space they actually would occupied. Then we would come back and provide if our parking needs to increase from what we have shown today, we would come back with an alternative plan to deal with that and then sometimes with these type of the buildings as you may know, if it is a tenant that has had the office parking and maybe not as much parking needed for the warehouse, that there's a way to put some office parking in the truck courts, segregated landscaping etc. to be able to add to the car parking that is needed for that particular tenant. So, we would look for alternative ways to add the parking necessary once tenants are identified. That would really be the case for both buildings as we're trying to guess as to what that office space is and the parking. With regard to lighting that's a miss on our part. We'll make that change. We know that was a big part of the approval process to date and we will adjust that so that is my miss, I did not get the information to our consultants soon enough to have it show up in the plans so we will fix that. Yes, let's talk about signage. Signage, it's on our list. We haven't gotten back to signage yet to show renderings of that signage as staff had mentioned. We're pretty dialed in with detail in terms of where those that signs would be and the sizes of signs. Our plan would be to come back and work with staff to provide that signage within the approvals that we have already received. So, that is on our list and that is next on our list actually. Trash enclosures kind of go along with the same vein as the office space that we typical will deal with trash enclosures whether it be a compactor or an exterior dumpster. Once we know who the tenant is and what their requirements are and where those enclosures would be within the building. That would be our plan on that is once we understand the tenant's needs. On the rooftop screening for both buildings built on a shell basis the warehouse space on both buildings we are utilizing HVAC systems that will not have units on top of the buildings. Where there would be air conditioning units placed on top of the building that will be screened is when we would land office tenants that would need air conditioning for their office space. At the time that we would know where those tenants would be and what that office space would look like where those units would go, we would come back with a plan showing how we will shield those units once they go up on the roof for those office tenants.

Mr. Meier: I think if you look at the site line drawings that he has up here, I don't know if they were included in your packet. I do have some 11x17's I could distribute. Basically, when we look at, because the topography varies so much on the site, I think the areas of concern are going to be the north east corner. Go back to building two there. It would be the northeast corner of building two because we're looking down at the building that site line gets skewed downward and so if we have some office units in that particular northern portion that building, I think those will have to have some rooftop screens attached to them. Once we know what those are in size and location we can work with you to make sure that those are screened from vision from Crescentville Road and the approach road to the office park there to the north. As you move further down to the south, like midship of that building and that, I think we can move and far enough back that you won't see them from the street. So, they can be screened with the parapet height. Same thing now when we move over to building three. The critical spot is going to be and that north wall. So, depending if we get an office user in the northwest corner that is going to require a physical screen. As far as the warehouse units, those are inside the building themselves and I think there's a small hood on the roof for some makeup air unit and a flu stack. So that is really not going to be super visible but again if there is an office in the northeast corner which is not really likely, I don't think we're planning on any office over there, if there is a rooftop unit for that it's probably going to need to be screened with a rooftop screen or wall of some sort. Again, we will look at those. I brought a pamphlet here so if you want to see what type they might be there are some that attach to the unit and use different types of panels that attach to the units so they are four or five-foot tall, whatever height that the unit is that would screen them from vision from the street. I think as we move further again to the south and southwest corner we can screen that with the building parapet wall and then as far as the far southeast corner, that's if the units to far east is going to be visible from that residential side, so I don't think, based on what we know right now, as far as the ways the way these would lease there's probably not going to

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
13 NOVEMBER 2018

PAGE 9

be any rooftop units because there won't be any office space on the eastern half. Now again if it happens we will have to put some sort of a vision wall to screen those units. As far as the building materials, I think in your package there's a sheet that had all the building materials attached to it and I also have physical samples of those I can leave with you tonight.

Chairman Darby: While there is a lull, could you please spell your last name?

Mr. Meier: It's Paul Meier, JRA Architecture.

Mr. Cumming: We want Dave speak to some of the, I crossed over pretty quickly on the civil related questions for good reason but Dave do you want to pick up where I kind of glossed over?

Mr. Wright: Yeah, sure.

(Someone talking off mic. not audible)

Mr. Wright: David Wright with Kleingers Group. Happy to be here with you all tonight.

Chairman Darby: Good to see you.

Mr. Wright: I did want to just cover a couple of the civil engineering things then I will also drop back to parking here at the end real quick. On the civil engineering items you know certainly we have worked with Mr. Shvezda and CT on this project and some other projects so we're going to work with them real closely and kind of work through these. The drainage items, those are probably from just a technical standpoint some of the things that we have to work the most closely with them on just to make sure we get the appropriate ponding depths that they're comfortable with. We are comfortable with, in talking to John, we are comfortable with having up to a foot of ponding in the truck docks only and only over top of a catch basins. So you understand we're not talking a foot of water across the entire truck dock. Just over top of catch basins in the very low points and the major major storm event. Basically the 200 or 300 year storm event which is what we are required to designed to here in Springdale. One thing I did want to touch on, just in terms of parking and it's just really from kind of my experience and history. I, in a previous life worked for Duke Realty kind of doing development services staff and we had in one point in time done a study on two of our industrial parks, World Park Union Center and World Park and what we determined was that there is about one person for 2000 square feet at least in those two industrial parks which total about 500 acres. I am not proposing that that is what is going to settle here because you don't know from building to building what tenants are going to come in but at least just from my standpoint that's one of the reasons that I feel relatively comfortable as an engineer kind of designing this parking lots of things with these guys. So, certainly if there are any engineering questions I'm here and happy to answer them. Other than that, I will turn it over to John.

Mr. Cumming: I don't have anything else to add. I'd be happy to answer any questions are comments along the way.

Chairman Darby: Staff, with those clarifications did you have some additional comments or questions?

Mrs. McBride: Just a question. Mr. Cumming, So, I know that you mentioned the foundation plantings for building two, there were some other comments on the landscape plan for two and three. I'm assuming that those are all acceptable?

Mr. Cumming: They were.

Mrs. McBride: Just to make you aware, so if you did need to come back and add additional parking, you're really close on the required open space for building two that's required a 30% and they're at 30.66%. So, just to point that out to you and then we'll look forward to seeing your revised photometric plan.

Mr. Cumming: Okay.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Hawkins: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just sort of piggybacking on what Mrs. McBride said. In terms of your alternative ways to supplement parking. I understand what you are saying in terms of using up some of the trucks space and truck parking. Was some of that, was some of the thought process taking away any more green space or trying to manage that within the surface area the that you already have?

Mr. Cumming: The thought there would be converting paved truck area at to paved car parking area.

Mr. Hawkins: Okay, but we're not talking about taking away any other green space that is already present?

Mr. Cumming: No, we're not.

Mr. Hawkins: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Okum.

Mr. Okum: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just a couple items, a few items. Mrs. McBride, we got another item on the agenda this evening with a PUD where there was a consideration for Planning Commission to consider being the City of Springdale been party to the covenants, is that likewise something that we should be considering for this development because of its impact on residences and so forth?

Mrs. McBride: We ready have, we are and was waiting for the record version to come back to the City.

Mr. Okum: So, we don't need to add that?

Mrs. McBride: No, they are done.

Mr. Okum: Okay. There was a reference to lighting compliant with our zoning code. That does require cut off fixtures and down lights on the wall packs I believe?

Mrs. McBride: Yes.

Mr. Okum: So, we don't need to worry about. I do have the same concerns about the, I guess you would call it the northwest corner, of both properties where the truck docks are going to be exposed to Crescentville Road. We've had that addressed on a previous property over and Northwest Boulevard, right? Yeah, and that is a concern of mine as well, mounding, plantings whatever. I'm not really concerned about the office view from Crescentville Road. I think that's sort of an advantageous to the development but on the truck percentage where the truck docks are scene from those Crescentville Road views, and the new, unnamed roadway that goes down. Do we have a name for the roadway by the way?

Mr. Cumming: We don't but we are working on it.

Mr. Okum: Okay. Can I drop a name?

Mr. Cumming: Absolutely.

Mr. Okum: Okay, Springdale Commerce Park Way, that's mine. I thought about that all weekend.

Mr. Cumming: It's got a ring to it.

Chairman Darby: We going to work Okum in there?

Mr. Okum: No, no personal names. Should you have a development go in that let's say needs large refrigeration cooling units, similar to deep freeze, where would those units, it depends on who goes but have you allowed for that in your design? You know that those would need to be screened and obviously we need to deal with that, how it would impact the residents, right?

Mr. Cumming: Yeah, I think with those type of facilities, we see them sometime located on the roof and sometimes located on the ground.

Mr. Okum: Yeah, Sam's, years ago ended up with them on the ground and we had some issues to deal with that makes it complicated. Just so that there is some understanding that that screening would be just as impactful there.

Mr. Cumming: It would be.

Mr. Okum: Do you have any comments about that mounding that I brought up on those northwest corners from the docking areas? Can you deal with that in your landscape plan?

Mr. Wright: I think, Mr. Okum, from our stand point on the Civil Engineering side, I think we can add mounding as it is feasible with the grading. We are challenged because we are coming down the slopes.

Mr. Okum: You are going down quite a bit.

Mr. Wright: Where we can add it we will, from my stand point we will add it.

Mr. Cumming: As it works, if it works from an engineering stand point we have no problem adding it.

Mr. Okum: Well you have a pretty steep slope on the back side that you are going to have to maintain. The only comment I was going to make to Mrs. McBride is, we should probably add the word sustainable vegetation to that because obviously when you plant those hillsides, it tends to be an issue of long term and that typically when things get cut in Springdale, it tends to be a lot of shale and ungrowable material. I guess the building materials are fine. There was a comment regarding the fences being repaired along Crescentville Road?

Mr. Cumming: The fences will come out.

Mr. Okum: They are coming out?

Mr. Cumming: Yes.

Mr. Okum: Okay. There was requirements under the formal approval and I am sure that is in the works, of the tree replacement part of the project. How is that handled now with this. Obviously you are planting trees.

Mr. Cumming: We are. So, the wetlands delineation report, the Army Corps of Engineers permits, that is all part of that process. We are still working with the Corps on that. In terms of the tree replacement, we are working with Mr. Taylor on confirming, and that will be a document that is probably updated as we go from phase 1 to phase 2 as trees are planted and trees are removed but we are working with Mr. Taylor and staff on counting exactly how many trees are going in, how many are coming out. Having a formula as to what our reimbursement payment is going to be up front.

Mr. Okum: Sure.

Mr. Cumming: So, that is in process.

Mr. Okum: One question regarding the architectural presentation. On the north side of the building, this is for the architect, there is some green, I guess there are green boxes, are those windows? Above the bays?

Mr. Meier: Yeah.

Mr. Okum: Those are windows?

Mr. Cumming: They are.

Mr. Okum: They are doing that on Seward Road on the new projects up there and actually it gives character to that side of the building and also brings life to the building which I think is important to a dock side. I think it would really add some color.

Mr. Cumming: We do that on most of the buildings and not only does it add some architectural appeal and a little more glass to that frontage but it is also helpful to the tenants inside just bringing that natural light into the warehouse.

Mr. Okum: I think that is pretty much everything, I just want to check. Give me just a second. Yup, that's it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: Thank you Mr. Chairman. A couple of things. One to kind of speak to the tree replacement situation, as Mr. Cumming mentioned we are trying to work this out as we go, however; the mass excavation piece, of course is going to be where most of the removal takes place and the arrangement is until we've got this tree replacement fund worked out and funded by the developer they are not going to be able to clear any trees even with the mass ex piece. So, I think we have a handle on it. It, as Jon mentioned, it's a little difficult to pin down right now, because the mystery component if you will, is the environmental mitigation that they have to do because they are going to be planning a significant number of trees south of Beaver Run and that hopefully will reduce the amount of payment that they have to make to the tree fund because we will get actual trees instead of money. Then the other thing I wanted to mention just for the record, as we go down the road with this screening thing, in particularly if there is some really kind of off the wall mechanical equipment, I mean obviously you guys are going to have to have the structure of this thing.

Mr. Cumming: Understood.

Mr. Taylor: What we don't want to have happen is, oh gee we didn't really design the roof to carry this so we can't put something up. So, just stating that for the record. That's all I have. Thank you.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Bauer.

Mr. Meier: I could speak to the structural part. We are working with the structural engineer to add some extra joist in here, that extra capacity to put some extra capacity along the perimeter where we think that there will be some rooftop units. Particularly, at these office locations. So, we are thinking of that, it is getting built in at this point so we are taking that into consideration.

Chairman Darby: Now, Mr. Bauer.

Mr. Bauer: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Few questions. Staff, Mrs. McBride, you didn't mention but your comments talk about in the building design, the 40-foot length elevation that break up the façade, is that no longer a concern?

Mrs. McBride: Where as it doesn't meet the strict interpretation of it these requirements were really designed for much smaller buildings, not industrial buildings. More retail, office, you know 30,000 square foot office not 300,000 square feet. So,

where it doesn't meet the exact criterial, it goes, we feel toward the intent, meeting the intent of the requirements.

Mr. Bauer: I ask that question because I know the building/warehouse type office building behind Pictoria Island, we went through great extent looking at that façade, similar type building, size wise. Is it similar?

Mrs. McBride: Yes.

Mr. Bauer: But we don't have that same concern here?

Mrs. McBride: Well, it is similar in that we feel that it meets the intent of those requirements. I mean again these are very large building even by comparison to the Pictoria building and so, you know the requirements just simply were not drafted for, we had no idea we were going to see something like this. So, we think that it meets the intent of that in terms of breaking it up and providing relief to the design.

Mr. Bauer: Same with the windows?

Mrs. McBride: Yes.

Mr. Bauer: Okay. One other comment that concerned me a little bit and I didn't hear anybody address it was the issue with site lines on public road two with visibility exiting that access drive. Are you guys looking at that and planning on taking care of that issue?

Mr. Meier: Yeah, we will relocate landscaping as required there to address the site lines.

Mr. Bauer: Okay. Then the last one is on parking. I am trying to wrap my head around what you would do there. Right now, you are short correct?

Mr. Cumming: We are short.

Mr. Bauer: And you are planning on taking up dock space depending on office?

Mr. Cumming: Yeah, if needed. We feel like the estimates on the amount of office space that we are using right now to kind of calculate the requirements are conservative, and I mean conservative by it is probably more likely we are going to have less office space than more office space compared to what we are assuming here. So, again it is just a guess, I think we are using 5% for both buildings. Typically, that ranges anywhere from 2 to 5% for these building.

Mr. Bauer: Right. But the parking field would be close to the building, it wouldn't be out.

Mr. Cumming: Correct.

Mr. Bauer: Okay. Alright, that was it, thank you.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Mr. Okum.

Mr. Okum: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Bauer, I had those same thoughts in regards to the massive concrete and the impact of that. I also had to reflect back on Northwest, the one over by Pictoria and there was a lot more, I put a lot more emphasis on that on its finish in my view in respect to, it was right adjacent to class A office with additional class A office going in next to it so I put a lot more emphasis on that. I think they have done a relatively good job with this with a break of colors and cuts in the concrete. It is a massive building, the only thing that breaks it is vertical elements like landscaping and trees and so forth because that's pretty much what we are going to have there. On the other hand I wanted to comment about that because I was really a proponent for the Pictoria site and that emphasis on that building structure. So, this is truly just as important but it is going to be located in more of a commercial industrial setting. The

other item that I was going to comment on in regards to the parking adjustment, would it be okay to say then that the dock area parking field will be used to address a parking shortage?

Mr. Cumming: Yes.

Mr. Okum: I would rather see that than a reduction of green space. Is that not good Mrs. McBride? I see the eyes?

Mrs. McBride: If I could only get my husband to get that same kind of read.

Chairman Darby: Mrs. McBride.

Mrs. McBride: So, the thing would be we would want to make sure that there is a clear separation between truck circulation and vehicular circulation so I would like to kind of reserve that right. The one thing that I had my light on for is that I would suggest, and I didn't say this in my comments but after the conversations here this evening that when the applicant does secure a tenant or tenants for a building and they are ready to move forward with that construction that a revised final, final development plan would come to staff that would address all of these items that we have talked about. Now if for some reason staff does not believe that that meets the intent of what the commission is going to act on this evening, assuming that they would be approving those or it is something, like for example you were talking about large coolant units on the ground or whatever. If it is something that we didn't feel comfortable or that we feel was out of the norm from what you thought you were acting on this evening, then we would bring that back to you but that they would bring back a final, final development plan for us, not the building set with all those sheets don't want that. So, would suggest that maybe that gets made in any part of a motion that comes from the commission.

Mr. Okum: So, since I am making the motion, when tenants are secured, the applicant will submit a final, final development plan for that specific.

Mrs. McBride: For staff review and approval, just to make sure that the landscaping items are addressed, that the photometric items are addressed, that the signage is compliant with what was consistent with the preliminary development plan, that mechanicals are properly screened, that the civil interests are addressed, that the circulation is complimentary between the truck traffic and the passenger vehicles and so forth. But again, if there are any issues that we feel aren't compliant with the intent of any action of the commission then we are going to bring this back to you all.

Mr. Okum: Does that make it complicated for the applicant in the fact that they may only get one of the three, of those say there's four, three main entries into a building and they only get one of them. I'm just trying to work this process out so.

Mrs. McBride: I would look at that one final, final development plan for one building.

Mr. Okum: Okay. So, once they have secured their first major tenant then that goes to building two.

Mrs. McBride: Right.

Mr. Okum: First major tenant building goes to building three. Does that work John.

Mr. Cumming: It does.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Hall.

Mr. Hall: Thank you Mr. Chairman. This is a question for the applicant. Am I understanding correct that I'm sure you have reviewed staff's comments on this that you are going to come into compliance with all of this because there is some that are left open like the lighting, the landscape and so on? What is your intent to do with staff's recommendations?

Mr. Cumming: It is our intent to comply with those items.

Mr. Hall: So, the record could reflect that you have a positive answer to working with the staff and working through the things that staff has suggested is that correct?

Mr. Cumming: Yes.

Mr. Hall: Thank you so much.

Mr. Okum: Mr. Chairman, I hereby move to approve the following project: SCP Springdale, 12110 Princeton Pike, buildings two and three case number 34084, per specifications and designs provided in our meeting packet as exhibits which were submitted by the applicant and reviewed by staff prior to this meeting. This excludes submissions and comments to staff's review by the applicant. This motion includes the following: Staff and City Engineer's, City Planner's report, recommendations, comments and considerations contained within their report. This being a PUD it shall include staff and Law Director's review and approval of the Covenants. The addition to staff's comments in front of vegetation on comment 3 the word sustainable shall be added. Special mechanical units screening from view of adjoining properties in the public right of way shall be provided and this shall be reviewed by staff for approved enclosures and screening. The landscaping plan shall be approved as submitted after staff's final review. Special buffer yard conditions shall be applied to the northwest side corners north nearest Crescentville Road to buffer the view of the docks and commercial truck parking area. The fences along Crescentville Road shall be removed. Special parking drive site plan conditions shall include the dock area parking field will be used to address the parking shortfall with safety review by staff. All four building elevations shall be based upon the color pallet submitted and the samples submitted. When tenants are secured, the applicant will submit a final, final development plan for staff review and approval.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: I'll second the motion.

Chairman Darby: It has been moved and seconded that this application be approved as identified in the motion. Secretary please call the roll.

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

Chairman Darby: We are getting there. Now by the way, you know once you get all of those leases taken care of you don't have to worry about all of these questions right?

(Laughter from audience and commission.)

Mr. Cumming: Questions never quit.

Chairman Darby: Thank you much.

#### VIII. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Nelson Online, 11560 Princeton Pike, Springdale, Ohio Revision to PUD / Lot Split (Application 34317)

Chairman Darby: Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: Thank you Mr. Chairman. This is an aerial view of the site. It is currently zoned PUD. This is the former Ponderosa restaurant location. The idea here is to demolish the Ponderosa and start over with a new building. This is a picture if you will of the site and the demolition plan indicating the Ponderosa building to be demolished. This is an architectural site plan that kind of shows the layout of the new building and the drive-up teller locations and so forth and the internal site circulation. Also, as part of this application, this is also a lot split as well. The Bank of America location is going

to have its own lot and then the Skyline will be separated from it. These are the elevations which are shown again in your packet. All of this stuff you have much more detail. I think that, I know Mrs. McBride and Mr. Shvezgda have further comment. Thank you.

Chairman Darby: Mrs. McBride.

Mrs. McBride: Thank you. As Mr. Taylor indicated it is a .68 acre parcel that was the previous Ponderosa. It is within a PUD and they are proposing to construct a 4,325 square foot US Bank Branch. So, since it is a PUD we are going to need the two members of Council to determine if this is a major or minor modification. Typically, those are based on things like density and use. This is a use that you would typically find in a commercial PUD such as the Cassinelli Square development, so staff feels that it is a minor modification but obviously that is up to the two Council members.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: I find it to be a minor modification.

Mr. Hawkins: I also find it to be a minor modification.

Chairman Darby: Thank you.

Mrs. McBride: We did provide the applicant with the comments that I am going to run through here with the commission this evening but we did not receive any response from them so I don't know exactly what their position is on these items. The PUD district requires a total of 30% open space on the site. The existing has 14.7% open space and post redevelopment they indicate that it would have 32.2% of open space so that is an increase obviously that is a positive thing. The 4,325 square foot bank building would require a total of 14 parking spaces based on our code requirements and they are proposing 15 so they comply with our parking requirements. They are proposing two drive-up ATM locations on the east side of the building, the side facing Cassinelli. They would require four stacking locations and they are showing four locations on the site plan. We will need them to add the two bicycle spaces that are bike rack spaces that are required by our code. We have asked them to show set back dimensions for the building and parking areas. We did not obviously receive those. The applicant indicated in their initial submittal that they were going to reuse the existing dumpster location and that it was to remain in the southeast corner of the site. That obviously, I will pass these pictures down, I don't know why it printed it 11x17, that was just what our printer was doing the other day. At any rate so obviously in no way conforms with our current requirements so whatever they are going to do they are going to need to create a dumpster enclosure that is going to comply with our zoning code requirements. One of their sheets indicated a ground sign but we don't have any details on that, particularly what the setback on that sign would be from 747, how big the sign would be, how tall the base, what it would look like, is it illuminated, etc., so we would need to see details of that. They supplied building elevations which indicated wall signage which was Bank of America and the logo on both the west, the south and the north elevations, but we did not receive any details of that wall signage so we don't know if that complies with the zoning code or not. We did get, as I mentioned building elevations and some of those were mislabeled but the building itself is to be constructed of a mixture of stone, EFIS, and wood siding. We have asked them to bring building material samples, color samples for the commission this evening. We have also asked them to provide details of any rooftop mounted equipment screening to make sure that is compliant with the zoning code. We had a number of comments on the landscape plan and obviously we didn't receive any reply to those. They are, with regards to lighting, they did submit a photometric lighting plan. We would consider this a medium activity level which allows for a maximum fixture mounting height of 24 feet, they are showing 30 foot poles plus the base height. Our code allows for an average illumination of two foot candles and they are ranging on average up to 29.43 foot candles. We have a maximum of 10 foot candles and they are showing 29.8 foot candles. They also exceed the 2.5 foot candles that is permitted at the property line. Now, having said that, and having done work for other financial institutions, there is an increased need for lighting under the ATM facilities at night for safety reasons. So, staff would work with them to provide adequate site lighting in that location, however; staff

does not believe that such an increase needs to be across the site. So, we would work with them on that because I do think that they do need to increase it over the permitted maximum of 10 by those ATM machines to provide secure access to the machines. So, those were all of my comments.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Shvezda.

Mr. Shvezda: Thank you Mr. Chairman. In regards to traffic, the information that was supplied by the applicant indicated that there would be a net increase of 41 trips in the AM peak and 30 in the PM peak, therefore; these are well below the 100 trip generation thresholds that we generally utilize for a detailed traffic study so that would not be necessary for this particular submittal. In regards to the access points, currently there is the access point that exists on 747. This also will be connected cross access easement wise to the property to the north, The Vitamin Shoppe facility that exists there and across into the Skyline property that will be a separate parcel once the cut up plat is approved. As the circulation is noted, traffic will enter from 747, proceed east and then have to circulate back onto the Skyline property in a northerly direction and then back to the west to access ATM machines. The current general direction of where the Skyline traffic is configured is to head southbound in the opposite direction of the traffic that would be approaching the ATM machines, there maybe enough room for two lanes of traffic but nothing was submitted as far as the applicant to show how that will be divided. If there is enough room for the two lanes of traffic, we will have to have a center line, pavement markings, signage noting of what is two-way traffic probably a do not enter sign at the Skyline at the face of the building because it becomes very narrow along side the building. So, those are things that will have to be considered on the part of the applicant to have this function. As far as storm water management the existing Skyline portion and the Ponderosa portion have no detention as it exists. The Thompson Thrift redevelopment of the Shell gas station to the north that contains The Vitamin Shoppe, Verizon, Aspen Dental does have a percentage of the detention basin for that site. Right now based on the impervious area reduction is about a 20% reduction that by the letter of the law as far as our Ordinances are written that they wouldn't have to provide post construction best management practices such as a hydrodynamic separator or an Aqua swirl if you will but our recommendation would be to request that it be a part of the development just because you've got not only this corner but kind of the whole area that is tributary to this is the whole Cassinelli Plaza area so trying to re-coop that. That concludes my comments.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Good evening

Mr. Garnett: Good evening council my name is Brandon Garnett with Nelson Architecture, one of the operating architects for Bank of America. With me as well we have Mr. Jacobs representing Bank of America and Mr. Ripple representing the property owner. We were in receipt, thank you, for the comments. I can go through those as an overview, we are more than amid able in accommodating all of those comments. In regards to the structure, I know that we touched on the acreage, the square footage, I won't hash over that again but in regards to the structure, Bank of America, just to give you kind of an oversight real quick, for a number of years, about five or six years they had kind of an outdated exterior prototype. Within the past year or so they have updated all of that branding, all of that marketing and now they have a new, revised exterior look across the whole nation where they incorporate materials such as stone. It is a faux wood so that we can force it into the bend because there is curved arch as you folks can see on the elevations and on the plans, this along Princeton Pike and then the other materials are just stucco and then either painted metal or aluminum cladding ACM paneling is what we utilize for the rest of the finishes. So, along the front elevation as you can see there on the top, the stone arch there is actually three arches that are happening here. There is a canopy or eyebrow above the store front that is one arch. The next arch is the wood paneling which is actually the structure of the building and then there is just a decorative stone arch that over encompassing and also creating some screening for the air handlers on the roof as well. It's a new modern design that the bank has just been implementing. We have done a fair number of these so far across the nation and it has been pretty successful so far. Most of the front elevation or in this case the west elevation would be the faux wood, the wood, the stone and the

east half would be mostly stucco is on the east half. In regards to the comments, we are amenable able to doing or accommodating all of them pretty much. We had a review meeting yesterday with our staff and there was only a few of them that we were speaking to and Mrs. McBride touched on that. The biggest one that we had was in regards to the lighting. As you noted the Bank of America and other banking facilities they have security standards or in regards to ATMs and employee entrance as well and she touched on in regards to the security standards for Bank of America is 10 foot candles within five feet and then at least 2 foot candles maintain within 60 feet. Some of the solutions that we have utilized in other locations is utilizing a fixture head with a diffuser on the back side of it to chop that lighting off so that it is not crossing the property line. As well as we can bring those lighting levels down from 29 foot candles to something that is more accommodating around 10. That was in regards to lighting. The other big note was the landscaping. Most of those items and it kind of ties in to lighting and the security standards as well with the bank. We went over most of those items, we can accommodate and share with City Staff all of our revisions in regards to accommodating those notes. The only items that we have a concern with would be just line of site. We usually do not implement any evergreen trees, most of our stuff is deciduous just so that nobody can hide behind it as well as all low-lying shrubbery and then we always have deciduous trees that have high branching six feet or above, just clear line of site is the goal there. Other than that, the other item was signage. I notice that signage was the other item. We do have a package together and we will submit to City Staff and it will illustrate heights, it is lit, we are proposing a ground mount sign for the monument and the building signage is back lit as well. There is no additional signage in regards to branding or marketing it is just the building signage and the monument along the street access. So, any questions? Concerns? Anything else I can answer:

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Mr. Bauer.

Mr. Bauer: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Couple questions. The first one is not really for the applicant, I'm picking on staff tonight. To the south of the site we approved the mini, I'm going to call it a hospital. Did you guys have a chance, I couldn't find any of my stuff on that site did you look at how these two sites would interact? Parking? Road wise? Access wise?

Mr. Shvezda: To be honest with you, not specifically. Now that you mention it there was a provision for a sidewalk on the medical building that did run to the north property line that would be the common property line with this development so there might be some consideration for extending that somehow. We can get that information to you.

Mr. Garnett: Yeah, most definitely we can accommodate that.

Mr. Bauer: Thank you. Mr. Shvezda brought it up in his comments, but when I reviewed this packet of information, that access and what I feel the main entrance to your bank would be would be off of 747 and to get to the ATM you are going out and around and back into the Skyline property and making a left turn against going the opposite way that most traffic would, how do you plan on taking care of that issue?

Mr. Garnett: We were proposing to just stripe it, lane sign it, or stipe it give vehicular access. We could also propose additional signage in regards to way traffic but unfortunately, I don't have civil engineering here with me. But that was kind of how we were going to accommodate that.

Mr. Bauer: So, Mr. Shvezda, you said that you thought after was ample room to put two a drive aisle both ways?

Mr. Garnett: Excuse me.

Chairman Darby: Is that something that staff has reviewed?

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: Has staff reviewed that?

Mr. Garnett: I'm sorry (talking off mic. not audible)

Chairman Darby: No, we like to be advised on handouts please.

Mr. Garnett: Oh, Okay. Sorry.

Mr. Shvegza: The last page notes the table with angled parking what the pavement width would have to be for the drive aisle. Just being out on the site and just pacing it off it was in that realm of 22 feet, 20 feet, 22 feet, so the applicant will have to verify that and confirm what the angle is on that parking within Skyline to see how that applies.

Mr. Bauer: Okay. Will you be able to work with them on that, as far as?

Mr. Shvegza: Hopefully all of the measurements will come out correctly and it will be easy to do.

Mr. Bauer: Okay. I thought I heard somebody, was that you Mr. Taylor, those are going to be separate lots. Is that an issue then with that, are they all part of the PUD, they don't have to have any agreements with Skyline to do what you are trying to do with the drive lane to the ATM?

Mr. Taylor: There will need to be cross access agreements through this whole development. I mean the Thomson Thrift piece, the Skyline piece, well actually the entire development it is all part of that PUD so it is all going to have to be documented so that everybody knows what their rights are and that the City knows obviously.

Mr. Bauer: Okay, thank you, that's it.

Chairman Darby: For clarity, let me address the issue of handouts. We may be able to work something here. Our position is, we don't want this commission to be put into a position where we are making a critical decision about information that has not been reviewed by our staff, because quite frankly they are smarter than we are. But, if you would like, if you would, if that is something that you would like to give to them and they can advise us if it is just supplementing something they have already presented to us we can go that way but we don't like to get anything that they have not been made aware of.

Mr. Garnett: Understood.

Mr. Jacobs: Thank you very much and sorry for the confusion.

(talking off mic. not audible)

Mrs. McBride: I think that we need to look at this further, I don't think that this is something that the commission we are prepared to have the commission act on this evening. Two additional things that I would point out. Because the plans were not dimensioned as staff had requested, I would ask that any motion would include that all of the setbacks required for the PUD be met since they have not indicated that they need any variances from those. Then the second thing is that since we don't have details for any of the signage they are indicating or in the conceptual submittal anyway they were indicating signage on three sides of the building and they are only permitted to have signage on one side of the building. We don't know how big the signs are or anything so I don't know if staff is comfortable, or I'm sorry if commission is comfortable providing us with parameters with which you would consider acceptable. If you want that to come back to you or it's hard for us to recommend that it is or it isn't acceptable because don't know how big it is.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Okum.

Mr. Okum: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I'm encouraged by what you want to do I just think there is a lot of fine tuning that needs to happen and this is a great concept and it needs to get somewhere. I had Mr. Bauer's same thoughts were spinning off doing a

lot split with Skyline Chili and which makes sense. On the other hand were, we've got a traveling method of utilizing their parking field which is their parking field in order to get access. Did you consider the, and I'm not a traffic engineer here, but did you consider the flow going across, turning left into the drive-up teller lines and then exiting into the Skyline site and not going through their property as a access point?

Mr. Garnett: We did. The only reason why we essentially did a 180 of what you are describing is we were trying to get underneath the canopy because our ATM lanes were under that canopy that were going to provide on the back side of the building.

Mr. Okum: I was just thinking the canopy could move a little bit to the north and you could get that function, again this is a great, this is number one shot at this that we are looking at and we have not had a lot of time with it. Had you responded to staff's comments, staff would have maybe been a little bit better off understanding and working through some of those things even before it got to us. The other item I had is, we are not, and I know we are tied to Thompson Thrift with the PUD but we required, I believe with the emergency medical facility prepare that they should prepare for cross access to your site in their development and you are not providing for that on your development so we need to get that mended and I realize based upon this drawing it is going to eat up green space.

Mr. Garnett: Understood. Yeah.

Mr. Okum: But, on the other hand, cross access in my opinion, in this particular case is a critical to that development there period, because going through the back end of Skyline's parking lot to get into your site and to get to the medical facility and all of that just doesn't work. So, that is the two comments that I had. The other question I had was on my list of items it the sidewalk across the front of the property which would tie with the emergency medical which would ultimately tie and give pedestrian access and it is good for your business as well. So, those are the things. Based upon that, there is a lot of things that aren't tied down here. I am encouraged by the building elevations, the use of the property and the conversion, all of that. I'm not ready to vote in favor of it.

Mr. Garnett: Understood.

Mr. Okum: So, I'd rather tell you that up front instead of bringing a motion to the floor and then the commission act on it and you don't get a favorable and you do get a favorable but I at this point can't support it but I am encouraged by it.

Mr. Garnett: Understood.

Mr. Okum: Okay.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Shvegza.

Mr. Shvegza: Just a real quick question. On Mr. Okum's comment about the cross access, could you repeat that, I didn't catch all of that.

Mr. Okum: Cross access to the emergency medical site south.

Mr. Shvegza: Actually we had a problem with that because that would circumvent the fact that you would have people maybe attempting to turn left into the driveway here to get to the emergency medical facility which was an issue.

Mr. Okum: I understand but to you're creating a significant number of additional cuts to accomplish it. You could basically have one cut here, one driveway, one access point for both properties and eliminate that and you would end up with a second elimination of a cut on Princeton Pike for both properties.

Mr. Shvegza: Right now there isn't a cut for the emergency facility they come in off of the signal.

Mr. Okum: They would come in off of the back end, you're right. But there is no connection between them and this property.

Mr. Shvezgda: Not directly, no.

Mr. Okum: They'd have to go into Cassinelli Square parking lot, meander through there, go through the back end of Skyline Chili, which is the way that I used to go to Ponderosa when I went to Ponderosa and everybody is shaking their head because we all did it and cut across their parking lanes to get to Ponderosa. So, I'm not totally in agreement Mr. Shvezgda, I still think we would like to see, I would like to see, for that purpose that cross access between the properties.

Mr. Shvezgda: Again, our concern is the higher degree of left turns at this location that would go to the

Mr. Okum: You're saying left turns off of Princeton into the development?

Mr. Shvezgda: Yes.

Mr. Okum: Because we already have one there. Okay. I understand that.

Mr. Shvezgda: That was our concern.

Mr. Okum: I understand that. So, if there was, like we did for Sam's in the other developments if there was a non-left turn crossover so that they could go down to the light and come in. We already have an extended curb there, right?

Mr. Shvezgda: It's true but if you extend that you are going to prevent that left turn into this facility as it exists. Or as it is proposed.

Chairman Darby: Folks it sounds like that's something the developer, once he is armed with the information about the other site they should put into a plan and they need to be armed with that information. Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Hawkins: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I like Mr. Okum, think it is a great idea, a great concept. There are some things that need to be worked through. Ultimately, you are going to need to come to a decision if you want us to vote on this or if you want us to vote to table it for you guys to go through and work through some of those other issues. I don't know where your thoughts are on that at this point.

Mr. Garnett: We would choose to vote to table.

Chairman Darby: The chair will accept the motion that this application be continued.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: I move that this application be continued to next month.

Mr. Hawkins: Second.

Chairman Darby: It has been moved and seconded that this application be continued until next month. Secretary please call the roll.

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

Chairman Darby: One comment for you. It is pretty obvious that there is a lot of work that needs to be done but I think you have heard from the comments we want this to work and we are going to work with you. So, we will see you next time.

Mr. Garnett: Thank you very much. Thank you, have a nice evening.

Chairman Darby: It has been requested that we take a five minute break, in Springdale time that is nine minutes.

- B. Cincinnati Commercial Contracting, 135 Northland Boulevard, Springdale, Ohio, Revised Development Plan (Application 34318)

Chairman Darby: Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: Thank you Mr. Chairman. This project is actually to relocate if you will the Sweeney Mazda dealership from its current location next to the Chrysler store down to I think it is labeled Used Cars now, is that correct at 135 Northland. This is aerial view of the facility currently. This is a site plan that shows the addition to the building and some of the other site work that is going to be taking place in order to make this work. This is the landscaping plan and this is a rendering of the building. These are the various elevations of the building. That's really all I have at this point Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Mrs. McBride.

Mrs. McBride: Thank you. The 4.76 acres are zoned GB general business district which does allow for new car sales and used car sales and automotive repair and service per our zoning code. Right now, the site contains a building that is approximately 19,240 square feet and the applicant is proposing to put on a 9,377 square foot addition on to the building and then that reconfigured building as Mr. Taylor indicated would become the new Mazda dealership sales and service center. By our code they need 85 parking spaces for the building at 1 per 400 and then one per service bay in there proposing the total of 15 service Bays for the 85 parking spaces. The applicant indicates that they are going to have 304 parking spaces. Those are display and or storage spaces depending on how you want to say it. Ten of those would be for customer parking, 17 for employee parking, and the rest would be for service parking and new and used car inventory. Staff thought the 17 spaces for employee parking was a little low given the fact that they have 15 service bays and obviously a number of sales associates and then the almighty manager, which everybody has to go and talk to before you can go and buy a car. But, at any rate there are obviously plenty of spaces onsite so, two things that we would ask relative to the parking onsite. One is that the customer and the employee parking spaces be designated with signage to make sure that there are adequate parking spaces available for customers when they do come in as well as for employees. Second of all that there would be no parking of any vehicles in the drive aisles or the access ways. A total of 25% of the site is required to be open space. Right now, they have 11.4% of open space and they are actually going to lose .4% open space so they would have 11% with the post development. We had a number of comments on the landscape plan. I think some of the majority of them dealt with what types of street trees should go in there given that there are overhead utility lines and we wanted something that would be sympathetic to the salt that is used on Northland and a few other comments that I think we can work with the applicant on relative to landscaping. We did not receive any information as to how waste is handled on the site so any type of waste system would need to comply with the requirements of the zoning code in terms of screening and landscaping and so forth. They are showing some preliminary signage on the south elevation of the building which would be Jake Sweeney Mazda with a logo and Service, all of which appear to staff on a preliminary basis to be channel cut letters, yes, and they have indicated that they would be submitting for that at a later date and that south elevation would be the elevation that would be allowed to have the signage. They are indicating that they are going to have three new rooftop HVAC units and that will be screened from view by the proposed parapet of the building with the redo. Staff would consider this a high activity level relative to lighting and that would allow you to have a maximum fixture mounting height of 32 feet. They are actually showing LED fixtures mounted at 24 feet. They comply with all aspects of our lighting requirements with one exception. They are a little bit over at one corner of the foot candles at the property line but given the fact that it's a commercial, a non-residential property staff is not concerned with that. So those were all of the comments that I had.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Mr. Shvezda.

Mr. Shvezda: Thank you Mr. Chairman. In regards to traffic, since there is no change in use as far as any additional trips generated there should be no change in that. Site

layout, currently there are two ingress and egress points from Northland Boulevard. Just noticing and we looked at it the southern driveway had had vehicles parked out into the driveway area which is not permitted. Additional access is also available through the BMW dealership which would connect to Jake Sweeney Place in addition the plans noted that the car carriers would access the proposed site through the BMW accessway via Jake Sweeney Place. As far as storm water management the plans note that there would be 783 square foot increase in the impervious area. Right now the current facility detention is provided in the area that was the most recently expanded parking lot for BMW so that is in place there. Since there is a very minimal increase in the impervious area associated with this location no additional detention is being requested. The plans do note that about 175 feet of existing storm sewer is to be removed and 170 feet of new storm sewer is to be constructed to accommodate the building expansion. We will just need the storm sewer analysis to verify that both of the catch basins and the storm sewer are adequate size to handle the contributory drainage area. Also, in that general area in regards to there being a break point along the driveway there is just a couple more proposed spot elevations are necessary just to verify that that is in fact the break point. In regards to the 20% net reduction vs. the treatment of at least 20% of the water quality volume, the plans do note a brand name, ADS Barracuda, which is the hydrodynamic separator which will be incorporated into the development. We will just need the information from the manufacturer to verify that the size of the particular device that is specified is adequate for the tributary area. Also, an operations and maintenance agreement will need to be complete for the post-construction water quality device and recorded as a covenant. That concludes my comments.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Good evening.

Mr. Patterson: Good evening ladies and gentlemen, my name is Matt Patterson, I'm with Cincinnati Commercial Contracting. I'm here on behalf of Jake Sweeney Mazda. I have some others here joining. Some of the ownership as well as Civil Engineer and Architects. So, we will be here to answer any questions you might have. Would you like me to go through the points?

Chairman Darby: The floor is yours.

Mr. Patterson: Okay. Alright, for the items that Mrs. McBride mention the six considerations, these we feel like these are really minor and easy to work through so, we don't see any issue here. As far as item 1 the 27 parking spaces, signage for customers and employees, if that is what you need to feel good about that we can put that in, otherwise I'm sure the GM will make sure that his people get parked where they need to. Either way. The minimum amount of open space to be located shall be 11%, I think it was noted that it looks like we were at 11% so we would just not encroach upon that. So we have no intention on changing the plans so it looks like we meet that one. Item number 3, landscaping, we had several little items on that, I apologize for that I wish we would have had that a little cleaned up better for you all so that would not have been on here but we will get those cleaned up. Item 4, signage, the only reason it is really not a final submittal on signage right now is we have to go through the process with Mazda and they have to weigh in and we have to make sure that they say this is what we want you to do and then we can bring that in. Right now it looks like what we have on the plan is what they have in their design intent documents so I don't expect anything different from what you see right there. Item 5, waste disposal onsite, yeah that is there and it is actually screened. Mr. Taylor do we have a floor plan on this one in your packet here? Okay, so does anybody have a laser pointer? It doesn't work on the screen? Yeah, the mouse. Go to the left, other left. So at the top of the showroom, on the north end of it, okay. Yeah your mouse it not cooperating is it? There is actually a screen wall, I don't know if I am tall enough. So, this is a screen wall right here, that is a break okay and there is a transformer that sits in here, you can't see it from the street because of the brick wall and there is a gate right here and then on the back side here is where the trash truck can come to pick up the dumpster. So it is screened in, there is not a gate on it now but you can't see it from any street just because you have nothing but buildings all around it.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
13 NOVEMBER 2018

PAGE 24

Chairman Darby: I have a request of you for our records, stand there at the mic and tell us what you just told us.

Mr. Patterson: Okay.

Chairman Darby: We have the visual.

Mr. Patterson: Alright so on the north end of the showroom building there is a brick screen wall. It not only hides the existing electrical transformer but it is where the dumpster is housed and can be accessed. There is no gate on it but it cannot be seen from any road. I'm almost confident to tell you that.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Mrs. McBride.

Mrs. McBride: We are going to need to have a gate though added to that. Then we will have to talk about the landscaping requirements and see what we can work out with that.

Mr. Patterson: Okay. That sounds good. So, we will work with staff on that, that was item 5. Item 6, rooftop mechanical equipment. This building is going to be rather grand and tall. That is part of Mazda's thing and with the parapet walls you won't see the rooftop equipment. We actually, we've got this modeled in Revit which is 3D software and we can sit on the street and look up at the building and we put rooftop units up there, you can't see them. So, we can provide that information in some way if it is helpful but we did look at that so I think we are good there. Are there any other items in here besides the six considerations that we should be addressing for you all?

Chairman Darby: Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I had a question on Mrs. McBride's comment four, you said you were in compliance with the 11%. A total of 25 % is required to be open space, am I correct on that? Okay. I wanted to make sure that I was not reading this incorrectly.

Mrs. McBride: Yes, 25% is required and right now they have 11.4% and they are decreasing the existing open space ever so slightly by .4% to take it to 11%, but it is 25% that is required, you are correct about that.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Okum.

Mr. Okum: Just two questions. Mechanical units, screened from adjoining properties as well?

Mr. Patterson: We can see that in the model when we go in and look at it.

Mr. Okum: Just need to show it to staff so that you can apply. In regards to your slight reduction in green space since you are well under the 25%. I mean there is parking spaces back in the corner, I mean I see this one on the south east corner there is one, two, three, four, five, six, six parking spaces that are actually in sort of a weird looking drive aisle, you could certainly blow those out and get a little bit of green space there and at least keep where you are at currently. No I'm not

Mr. Patterson: Conceptually you are correct.

Mr. Okum: I mean you are not losing, there are parking spaces all over that thing that aren't going to get used.

Mr. Patterson: Well we would

Mr. Okum: Well okay, you guys fight for it but you guys have Tri-County Mall's garage now remember. So, we had that discussion before. I do remember that. No I hear you.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
13 NOVEMBER 2018

PAGE 25

Chairman Darby: Was that choreographed when those heads did like this.

Mr. Okum: Those, at least those spots right there because it is a weird layout anyway, I don't see, is that specifically for a specific use, that area back there?

(Someone talking from audience off mic)

Mr. Okum: That would be on the southeast parking field.

Mr. Patterson: That's all inventory

Mr. Okum: That's just inventory.

Mr. Patterson: That's inventory, display.

Mr. Okum: You see those five spots there that sort of look, yeah right there.

(Someone talking from audience off mic.)

Mr. Okum: You are.

(someone talking from audience off mic.)

Mr. Patterson: They really need every spot that they can get for inventory.

Mr. Okum: I'll leave it to the commission. Beating up on me bad enough. 11%, I mean that is such a small, yeah. Okay. That is all I have for now.

Chairman Darby: At this time we are lightless. Ready?

Mr. Okum: Mr. Chairman, I move to approve CCC's 135 Northland Boulevard, case number 34318, am I right? To include specifications and designs contained in the exhibits submitted and reviewed by staff prior to this meeting. This includes all staff, City Engineer's and City Planner's report, comments and recommendation and considerations, there is no PUD here. That is the extent of my motion Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Hall: Mr. Chairman, I would like to second the motion please.

Chairman Darby: It has been moved and seconded that this application be approved as identified in the motion. Secretary please call the roll.

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

Mr. Patterson: Thank you ladies and gentlemen. Have a good evening.

- C. Signet Services, Inc., 403 East Kemper Road, Springdale, Ohio, Revision to PUD Development Plan (Application 34401)

Chairman Darby: Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: Thank you Mr. Chairman. This is the former Christian bookstore location and part of this, they are actually subdividing this tenant space into two tenant spaces and the request here, and this is part of the PUD by the way sorry. This is the site this is Kemper Road up here and this is the total Springdale Plaza and this is where the location that we're talking about. The items in question here, one is this little I guess the kind of keystone element that they are proposing above the arch. This is an extension of the canopy that is currently there now and this is in addition of a new storefront again because they're splitting this into two tenant spaces. So, what is before you is the keystone, the canopy and the store front which I think is in general is in keeping with the rest of the development. That is all that I have.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Mrs. McBride.

Mrs. McBride: The only thing that I am going to tag onto that is that any of the signage for the new tenant, Spectrum signage is already up, we have reviewed and approved that, but signage for the new tenant on the east of Spectrum would have to comply with the zoning code and I would also need to have the two council members indicate that this was in fact a minor modification since it is a PUD.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: I find it is a minor modification.

Mr. Hawkins: I also find it is a minor modification.

Chairman Darby: Thank you very much. Mr. Shvegza do you have anything?

Mr. Shvegza: No comments.

Chairman Darby: Okay, move on from here. I would add that as we considered this whether or not it needed to come before the commission. Past practice we had very similar situation where façade was being changed and it came here so we felt that we would be remiss if we didn't allow you guys to give your opinion on it also. So, what you see is before you. Mr. Okum.

Mr. Okum: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just a comment in regards to the colors. They do vary differently a little bit than what we have in the rest of the development. So, it doesn't really matter to me. The colors are sort of neutrals and it doesn't make a lot of difference but, am I right or am I wrong? I believe these colors, if this is true to color pallet it is slightly different. Gray grays.

Mrs. McBride: I think the applicant is here and maybe he could address that because it may just be the printer, the way it came out.

Mr. Howe: Hi, I'm Matthew Howe with Kastler Design. What we are going to try to do is achieve what the color pallet is on this face of the building. So, we are not planning on changing that. There is the keystone that is located one of the other portions of the building that we are going to try to mimic and that is why we are adding the keystone to the building.

Chairman Darby: Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: Thank you Mr. Chairman. On the application it says that you want to extend the canopy and add pineapple. I don't see a pineapple. I don't know what you are talking about. I want to make sure I'm thinking the right things.

Mr. Howe: It is the keystone.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: Okay, I was like, add a pineapple. That was a very interesting, I just wanted to make sure I knew what we were talking about.

Chairman Darby: I think we are ready.

Mr. Okum: Mr. Chairman, I don't know if he has anything else that he wants to say.

(Laughter)

Chairman Darby: Quit while you are ahead. The floor is yours.

Mr. Okum: He doesn't seem like he is going to make any more comments. I'll make a motion. Mr. Chairman I would like to make a motion for the approval of Signet Services, 403 East Kemper Road, case number 34401. I always check to make sure I get the number right. To include the specifications and designs contained in the exhibits as submitted and reviewed by staff prior to this meeting. To include all staff, City Engineer's, City Planner's report, comments, recommendations and considerations.

Mr. Hall: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to second that motion.

Chairman Darby: Thank you very much. It has been moved and seconded that this application be approved as indicated in the motion. Secretary please call the roll.

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

Chairman Darby: Congratulations.

Mr. Howe: Thank you Council.

- D. T.J. Ackermann, Springrose Subdivision, West Kemper Road Project, Springdale, Ohio, Final Development Plan (Application 34435)

Chairman Darby: Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Now, the long awaited Springrose Subdivision. This is an application for the final PUD plan. Last Wednesday night Council did vote to accept your recommendation for approval of the preliminary development plan and the rezone. So, they are before you tonight with an application for the final development plan. By way of a rehash this is the site all of you familiar with. This is Kemper Road. CVS over here. Route 4, if my mouse will cooperate right there. This is the plan, this is a rendering that was presented to Council when they heard this case last week and you will note, as you all recommended these lots were changed from the 40 feet to 48 feet and the total number of lots was reduced from 52 to 50. So, that is in fact the plan that council voted to approve. This is the actual dimension plan that is in your packet and again you can see on you that these lots have been changed to 48 feet wide. This is a grading plan that kind of shows the location of utilities and the grading features and so forth. That is that.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Mrs. McBride.

Mrs. McBride: Thank you. As indicated, Council approved the PUD rezoning and that was contingent with a recommendation from Planning Commission that the number of lots and total dropped from 52 to 50 and you can see under number one on my staff report that reflects that decrease in the number of lots. The second item on my staff report has been addressed. Initially we did not have the property owner signature and the affidavits but that has since been submitted so that has been cleared up. The PUD requires a minimum of 20% of the gross. The site that the common open space and they are continuing to propose 23% of the gross acreage of the site or 3.13 acres would be open space. We have asked for covenants between the developer and the City as to how that open space is going to be developed, maintained, treated; is it, you know going to be cleared up and left in semi natural state, is there going to be you know a walking trail and benches? Whatever we need to have some information on that. Our code requires two parking spaces per dwelling unit and they are actually providing four. They have two in the garage and two on the driveway pad as well as there are 10 additional overflow guests' spaces that are located on the western portion or the eastern portion of the western portion of the development of that make sense. They are proposing some entry signage. We met with the applicant and their representatives yesterday afternoon and it is going to be basically a simple monument sign that is going to be roughly 2 foot by 2 feet carved sandstone on an either brick or stone column non-illuminated just with the name of the Springrose development on there. They would be submitting final plans for that to staff for review and approval. We had some comments on the landscape plan when we met with the applicant yesterday. They did put together a landscape plan and originally, they were indicating 1, 2-inch caliper tree for every lot. One of comments that we heard from the commission, from Council, by residents was there was a concern particularly on Kemper that we didn't want it to look like a row of soldiers marching down there. So, what we've suggested and the applicant agreed to is that for the lots that are accessed to the rear from the alley, those lots that do not have a driveway frontage coming like the ones on Kemper will actually have two

street trees and they would be 2 ½ inch caliper. We also have suggested a mixture of street trees so as opposed to having all Oaks on Kemper and all Maples on another street or whatever in case there was some problem with that species we would not lose all of the street trees. Also, we think that that would provide a more natural look than a whole row of Maples. So, the applicant is willing to work with us on that and they will be submitting a revised plan for the landscaping. We also talked to them about the lighting for the development. It is going to be LED coach style fixtures and there was a sample of that I think on the front page of their submittal. They are going to be 13 to 14 feet in height. They are actually going to be put in and owned by Duke. They are going to be operated by the HOA. The City will not be owning or operating those. The last item we had in our discussion was that there would need to be some type of Covenant between, as we mentioned, the developer and the City, that they would both be parties to. That it would be recorded and that we would all have copies of that. So, in that document, in addition to the, how that open space is going to be treated and how it is going to be maintained, could be things such as the number of, I'm calling, number of repetitive house styles, so that you don't have five houses right in a row or the minimum unit size or if they are going to be staggered setbacks. You know 30% of the homes on Kemper may be are, have staggered setbacks. Again, trying to go to varying the look as opposed to a straight row of homes on some of these streets. Where if there was a desire on the part of the Planning Commission to minimize or maximize building materials or whatever, we would suggest that, that document be put together. That could, if the final development plan was to move forward, it could move forward with the condition that, that document would come back to Planning Commission for review and approval, signature and recording prior to the issuance of any building permits on this site, so as to not hold things up this evening. So, those were all of the comments that I had.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Mr. Shvegzda.

Mr. Shvegzda: thank you Mr. Chairman. As far as the public infrastructure, just as a comment the Public Works Department is in the process of preparing their detail review comments that those would be very detailed in nature. As far as our comments the proposed public streets, Dorothy Lane will be 20 feet back to back, 50 foot right away the same as Maxey Lane, both with 4-foot wide sidewalks on both sides. Volker Alley will be 20 feet wide back to back, 40-foot right of way with no sidewalks. These are consistent with what was part of the preliminary plan approval. In addition, the terminus of Smiley Avenue will have the cul-de-sac constructed to better permit the vehicles to turn around. All of the other streets noted as Alleys will be private streets via ingress, egress and utility easements. As far as improvements within the existing and proposed right of way they will be in accordance with City standards, obviously with exception of the widths as noted. Such items would be the roll curb would be 30-inch wide roll curb that is utilized in the subdivisions. Sidewalks thickness would be 5 inches outside of driveways and 7 inches at driveways and the cities in the composition will be utilized. Additional detailed information will include such items as typical sections for the roadways, cross sections for the roadways, an intersection type detail for the cul-de-sac at the end of Smiley Avenue. As far as sidewalks, sidewalks within the existing public right of way will be constructed along the south side of Smiley Avenue between Rose and the east terminus that is 5 foot wide. Also, on the east side of Rose Lane from smiley avenue to West Kemper Road, again 5-foot wide and the north side of west Kemper Road between Rose Lane and the east limits of the proposed development. Again, also with 5-foot wide. The majority of the proposed sidewalk along West Kemper because it is located immediately in the back of the new right of way of which 15 foot additional be dedicated, this places the face of walk approximately 21 feet off of West Kemper edge of pavement. That's scaled to left approximate and that's about 21 feet off. The proposed sidewalk in front of the corner property at 484 West Kemper Road, which obviously is not part of the development, is located approximately again this is scale, 5 foot off of the edge of pavement. The other location that is non-typical is where it comes across the existing culvert. They're, just in scaling off of the proposed plans indicated that it was about 2 feet off of the West Kemper edge of pavement which is not acceptable for the protection of the pedestrians. Also, on that particular area there is a note that indicates that custom headwall expansion will be used to allow the sidewalk to be constructed and that the structural plans have details for this work. The

structural plans were not a part of the submittal. If you'd look at that next page, a location in that vicinity there is a guardrail and I forget what the offset the is from the edge of pavement but it would be the recommendation that wherever the sidewalk, the proposed sidewalk would be placed, it would be on the, basically the protected side of the guardrail and all such that there would be a physical barrier to protect the pedestrians in that area. Regarding the additional grading details, we will need that obviously for the West Kemper Road culvert, for the sidewalk there. The area adjacent to 484 West Kemper and also at the tie in location at the east end of the project. Regarding Maxey Lane and its intersection with West Kemper, there is an area of sufficient pavement width in that location to provide a minimal left turn lane into Maxey Lane for east bound traffic so we will just need additional information from the applicant as to how that pavement modification will take place as far as the pavement markings. As far as storm water management, there is two detention basins, one on the east and one on the west side of the existing stream. They appear to be acceptable in terms of storm water detention volume. The east basin is approximately 10,487 cubic feet of volume. On the west it is approximately 19,428 cubic feet of volume. Basically, the major storm is to be conveyed to the east via storm sewer but there is one location where there is a ditch that conveys it over so we will need calculations to verify that the ditch has the capacity. Originally the submitted plans show some of the grading for the detention basins is encroaching out into the FEMA flood plain that is noted in that area. In working with the applicant, they have modified it so that the grading limits are now located outside of the FEMA flood plain limits so that has been taken care of. One other comment as far as the storm water management, in the plans that were submitted there was a segment of open channel that existed on lot 23. There is an existing 30-inch storm sewer that outlets from Rose Lane that would have been carried via a ditch across that corner of lot 23. We have worked with the applicant and they are looking at essentially leaving the ditch or swale there in place to handle just the local drainage and to provide storm sewers that would convey that flow from that 30-inch under Rose to a storm sewer system so it would never be out in the open and it would essentially outlet at a point where it would discharge into the creek that exists in the middle of the development. So, they have supplied some information on that and we are still reviewing it but it appears to be an acceptable resolution. As far as water quality volume, the east pond, approximately 5,484 cubic feet of volume for water quality is provided and the west pond about 11,538 cubic feet of volume has been provided. Again, since this is post construction, water quality and operations and maintenance agreement must be prepared and approved for the city and recorded. As far as construction and sediment control, this will require storm water pollution prevention plan that would need to be reviewed and approved by the city. As far as utilities, the sanitary sewer availability and water availability have been received but final plans have not been approved by those utilities at this point. Again, just as a reminder the electrical, as far as Duke there is overhead line that runs through that, basically the open space that will need to be dealt with through construction at least. That concludes my comments.

Chairman Darby: Thank you sir, very thorough. Would the applicant like to come forward? Good evening.

Mr. Ackermann: Good evening. Thank you very much for having us here and for considering our application again. On behalf of my partner Ralph Meierjohan and myself, we would like to thank the staff and the consultants for meeting with us, for working through the issues and providing what we see as acceptable options and solutions to coming up with resolutions to any open and outstanding issues. I'll pledge our commitment to continue to work with them to make sure that we meet the criteria that they establish and we come up with something that we would bring back to Planning Commission on any open issues, so we appreciate your consideration. We would very respectfully ask for your support of the development and the way that it is proposed currently.

Chairman Darby: Well since you are giving out the at-a-boys, from this side let me say to you we appreciate the way that you have worked through this process with this commission, the community members and with everyone else that has been involved with it.

Mr. Ackermann: Thank you very much. It's been my pleasure to do so in the same fashion.

Chairman Darby: Oh, I'm sorry we have residents. Do the residents have comments?

Mr. Ackermann: If I may introduce, Dr. Volker and his wife. These are the majority of the property owners for the large piece. So, we have been working with them through the whole process. They have been very supportive and very patient and very complimentary about the overall process. They have been fascinated to watch this go through and have complimented the input that has been able to be achieved and received and been receptive to, from the residents and from ourselves as the developer. It has been quite an education.

Chairman Darby: I'm glad you said that. I want to let the group in on something. The first evening we met, you know what that was like. Well when we had a break, I looked out and I saw this very impressive looking couple. First time I had seen them in my life. So, I left my seat and I went down and I said, "I have no idea how old you are but when my wife and I get your age, I hope we look as good as you do." (laughter) We introduced ourselves and then they told me, we are the major owners over there, and I ran. I was afraid about this ex parte communication thing. But it is good to see you again. Okay. Mr. Okum.

Mr. Okum: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I did spend some time reading the, of course the Covenants and I just have a few questions as I went through it. What is the difference between a Class A and a Class B member? Can somebody answer that for me so I understand it? It is listed in the Covenants.

Mr. Ackermann: I'd have to read through that myself.

Mr. Okum: Okay, leave it to the attorney. I'll leave that to staff to understand what Class B and Class A is.

Mr. Ackermann: My attorney has left this evening so,

Mr. Okum: I don't want to be a B if I can be an A.

Mrs. McBride: No, I just want to be clear. So, the Covenants that were submitted for Planning Commission review, those are Covenants between the Developer and the HOA. Those are not going to be Covenants that are going to the ones the City is going to be a party of.

Mr. Okum: Okay.

Mrs. McBride: We are going to have a separate set of Covenants that are not, he submitted that as information.

Mr. Okum: I understand.

Mrs. McBride: Okay.

Mr. Okum: So, then questions like zoning compliance which is related in their Covenants would still be in our set of Covenants as well?

Mrs. McBride: Our approval will be his final development plan.

Mr. Okum: So, let's say somebody wants to put a shed on their site, and it is approved by the HOA, is that regulated by our zoning or is that regulated

Mrs. McBride: As far as the city is concerned it is regulated by our zoning and then it would be up to the HOA if there are separate conditions that pertain subject to those Covenants.

Mr. Okum: That are typically more severe that the City of Springdale.

Mrs. McBride: Correct.

Mr. Okum: Because there are things in here like, it allows for front yards and driveways to be asphalt and we don't typically approve asphalt driveways so. I don't know if we are going to have asphalt driveways. That is something that I was going to ask the developer on. Are we? We don't know. I thought we'd be concrete.

Mrs. McBride: Yeah, I don't believe that we regulate whether they are asphalt or concrete driveways.

Mr. Okum: We don't? Okay so they could be asphalt?

Mrs. McBride: Correct.

Mr. Shvezda: It would be asphalt aprons that would not be permitted.

Mr. Okum: Okay. I did have some questions regarding your rental situation because Air B&B is very popular. I have a family member that Air B&B's his home. That is rental not leasing. You might want to look at that in your Covenants because you are referring to leasing and Air B&B can be very impactful to a neighborhood. Because it is very popular even in neighborhoods that you don't expect it. Just a comment and I want to make it part of the record. Let's see what else did I have? I was going to ask, Bob are they going to be depressed curbs on the driveways?

Bob: Roll curb.

Mr. Okum: For the driveway entries, will they be depressed curb or straight up rolled?

Bob: It will be just the straight rolled curb.

Mr. Okum: Okay. In regards to the areas where the mailboxes and the parking areas are concerned, will that parking area be part of the shared expense in maintenance by the association, the parking area as well?

Mr. Ackermann: Yes.

Mr. Okum: As to the Alleys, because the Alleys fall.

Mr. Ackermann: Yes.

Mr. Okum: It didn't really list the parking areas associated with it. Do you plan on having a, the mailbox you are going to put a mailbox destination point on Smiley is that correct?

Mr. Ackermann: Yes, that is correct.

Mr. Okum: Are you street lighting Smiley at all with the Carriage lights or not? You are?

Mr. Ackermann: That would be

Mr. Okum: I guess if there are some pole lights there currently, they will just sort of hang there on the opposite side of the street?

Unidentified man audience: Duke Energy basically

Mr. Okum: Will change it out?

Unidentified man audience: Yes, they will make that determination.

Mr. Okum: That, I think that is everything that I had. Let me just check real quick. I did look at the plans to. Imagine that. Trash collection locations for the Alleys, where will that be done? When I have got my garbage cans to take out, I have five houses on an Alley, does Rumpke

Mr. Ackermann: Each house.

Mr. Okum: back down the alley and picks up the trash in front of the units.

Mr. Ackermann: The Alley is basically, it's a full street.

Mr. Okum: I mean this is a new experiment here.

Mr. Hall: That is the way it is in Olde Gate.

Mr. Okum: He does in Olde Gate, he backs down? I was going to suggest that when you're doing your final plans, if there are any flat areas near the FEMA flood plain area that is open space that you create a neighborhood garden area. It is very popular; Hamilton County is promoting it and the other areas of the region are promoting it. There might be some flat areas especially near that parking area off of

Mr. Ackermann: That would be something that we can recommend to the HOA once that is established. They can maintain that because they will be responsible for the open space.

Mr. Okum: Right, exactly.

Mr. Ackermann: So, we can give them ideas and make suggestions.

Mr. Okum: Sure.

Mr. Ackermann: Then the HOA can adopt and manage themselves without any burden or responsibility on behalf of the city.

Mr. Okum: Okay. That is all that I had.

Mr. Ackermann: Thank you.

Chairman Darby: Mrs. McBride.

Mrs. McBride: Just, in any motion that might move forward, since having met with the applicant just yesterday on the Covenant issue, that the Covenants would be between the city and the developer would be developed, approved, executed and recorded prior to any building permits being issued.

Mr. Okum: Is it an individual set of Covenants between or is it The Covenants between?

Mrs. McBride: One set.

Mr. Okum: Then reviewed, executed and recorded. Got it. Okay. I think I am ready Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Darby: Ready to go. Mr. Okum.

Mr. Okum: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move to approve the T.J. Ackermann, Springrose Subdivision, 34435 project for approval. This shall include specifications, designs and exhibits as submitted and reviewed by staff prior to this meeting. With the following conditions that shall include all staff, City Engineer, and City Planner's report, comments, recommendations and considerations. This being a PUD shall include staff and Law Director's approval of the Covenants and final review by this commission. The set of Covenants between the City and the development shall be reviewed, executed and recorded prior to any building permits being issued. That's it.

Mr. Ramirez: I'd like to second.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. It has been moved and seconded that the application be approved as indicated in the motion. Secretary please call the role.

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

Chairman Darby: Thank you for hanging in there with us.

Mr. Ackermann: Thank you all very much, it is appreciated. Good night.

IX. DISCUSSION

Chairman Darby: Mr. Shvegza, you were on. Mr. Okum.

Mr. Okum: Yeah, I just had one comment for Mr. Ackermann and the folks that are here. Being involved in the city for as many years as I have, a project of this importance to the City of Springdale, it typically would take till 1 or 2 in the morning so we are very pleased that we got through by 9:30 tonight. Thank you very much.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Okum: That's right. You got it.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Hawkins: Thank you Mr. Chairman. When the Bank of America comes back is it possible to have the overlay of the medical facility given to us with that just so we can keep that in mind?

Mr. Taylor: Sure.

Mr. Hawkins: Thank you.

Chairman Darby: Since you explained to some, would you tell the rest of the group about the status of that project at this time?

Mr. Taylor: As you all know, you all approved the final development plan and that is the extent of my knowledge, however; Mrs. McBride, knower of all things.

Chairman Darby: Anderson.

Mrs. McBride: We approved in Anderson, I sit on our Zoning Commission, we approved the exact same hospital with the exact same people in a retail center on the south side of Beechmont and we have seen nothing since we approved it either.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: How long ago was that?

Mrs. McBride: Probably about six months or so ago, it was after the approved it here but it was within two months of the approval here.

Chairman Darby: Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: I was going to ask I was at work like once we approve it did have to build and how does that even work?

Mrs. McBride: It is approved and we have the period of time where if they don't build they have to come back in and we knew it. But they can't,

Chairman Darby: Is that a year?

Mrs. McBride: I'm sorry?

Chairman Darby: Is that a year?

Mrs. McBride: I believe so I can double check. But, they can't build anything different until they come in and get our revised plan.

Mrs. Russell: So, I frequently have that question myself and am asked that question. So, I have tried numerous times to reach out to the developer and I suspect my messages aren't getting through because I'm not getting calls back. But, I found a kind of backdoor way to get some information and spoke with the owner who is selling the property to the hospital group. I received good news that they are current on non-refundable deposits that they have to make to the property owner in order to purchase the property and they are on track for a closing at the end of January which I guess has been the timeline all long. He also shared that because of the intricacy of this facility, that the design takes a lot longer than what we are typically used to seeing when it comes to the retail or industrial buildings that we get the preliminary that their final and they are in with building permits right away. It is actually quite a long jump from the final development plan to building permit plans. So, at least that is what I was told. So, the fact that they are continuing to pay non-refundable money that because that clear sign that they are still moving forward.

Mr. Okum: Can somebody tell us what is going in where the old Bed Bath and Beyond was?

Mrs. Russell: It is a Ross Dress for Less.

Mr. Okum: A what?

Mrs. Russell: Ross Dress for Less, which is similar to TJ Maxx.

Mr. Okum: Really, okay.

Mrs. McBride: You approved that.

Mr. Okum: Yeah, we did but they wouldn't tell us what it was.

Mrs. McBride: You wouldn't know who it was but, yeah.

Mrs. Russell: It is new to market so, much like Bank of America, these will be one of the first local location, bank branch locations. A Bank of America in our region that will be one of our first in our region so, we are happy to get those.

Chairman Darby: I want to raise a question to you and somebody can answer it if they want to. I think it was a real mile stone to have approved the Ackermann project tonight, but we all know as we sat through the many many discussions and comments and I think one of our Council persons stated it so eloquently, number 1 that project changes Springdale. Okay, we have never seen anything like it. Most communities have not, but if it is truly going to work that traffic issue has to be addressed and I look at my Council buddies and say, are we going to ever tackle Kemper Road?

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: You just want me to answer? Well I believe that Mr. Shroyer, who came and spoke during the last Planning Commission when we had this conversation, had also addressed the fact that in order to address that, we would have to make that road wider, which means that we are going on to people's properties. That is their front yards basically. Depending on, I think he was estimating about 20 feet they would need on each side and that is a lot of front yard that people would have to be giving up. Doesn't belong to us, it belongs to the home owners from what I understand it would be up to them to. Correct me if I am wrong her Mr. Hawkins, I've never been through something where we have widened using

someone's property. Wouldn't that be up to the homeowners on how we would proceed? We can't just go in and take their front yards away.

Chairman Darby: It's called Eminent Domain.

Mr. Hawkins: We can take it.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: We can? Okay.

Mr. Hawkins: You get into the issue of, much like the sidewalks

Chairman Darby: You'll never get elected again but you know.

Mr. Hawkins: Much like the sidewalk issue between Lawnview and Route 4. The impact on those resident's front yards and we saw a lot of comments with regard to that idea. We'd be taking their property essentially. So, that becomes the issue. It's not, I'd say it like this, it's not something that is without consideration and it is going to be watched and we will see how some of these things evolve from there. It's interesting to see the information regarding the traffic study and the initial thought that there wasn't even need to have a traffic study based on their data but it will be interesting to see what all that looks like in the long run.

Chairman Darby: The traffic problem is already there.

Mr. Hawkins: Right. There's not going to be

Chairman Darby: This project, will it increase it, yes but I don't know if it is going to be that market.

Mr. Okum: The safety, I mean we have right of way there. I mean Kemper Road is wider than the street is and I don't know exactly where those lines are, Don does but we've got more width on Crescentville Road but those people have felt that property is part of their for an eternity, for 30, 40, 50 years, as long as those houses were there. So, they sort of feel like it is their property, they have been taking care of it they have been cutting it and so forth. It always happens but the safety of it is, safety always has to out weigh those needs and even the safety of a left turn land or a safety turn lane like Don was able to get that. What is the name of that street named, Maxey, because there is enough right of way width in with the dedication what they gave 10 or 15 feet? 15 feet of dedication we were able to get a left turn land there. That helps for safety in this in a safety situation. Sure, there are certain times of the day that 275 from Springdale all they way to Colerain Avenue you can't go west and that is one time a day for about 40 minutes and after that, you can go east to west any other time. So, traffic is going to be at certain places at certain times, it is just the safety that I am always looking at, at least when I look at roads and stuff I want to see that there is a safe lane for me to turn in. For the purpose of that not that I have four lanes of traffic going past these houses when the backup is 40 minutes a day. That is when your safety issues hit.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: I agree.

Mr. Okum: We've got a great engineer here in the City that can give you guidance on it.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: If the new neighborhood goes in and they build those sidewalks, there isn't going to be a whole lot of room, correct once the sidewalks are in on that side? Will that give, how much room is there to widen that road if they did want to widen it?

Mr. Taylor: It is a half width right of way.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: Okay.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
13 NOVEMBER 2018

PAGE 36

Mr. Shvezda: Sidewalks are actually right on the right of way lines. It is a matter of

Mr. Okum: Do you need, what I was saying, do you need four lanes to handle 40 minutes of traffic or do you need safety lanes at your intersections?

Chairman Darby: Mr. Shvezda, your light.

Mr. Shvezda: Just two comments. Back when we were going through the process of having the public meetings for the sidewalks, actually the sidewalks would have been constructed within the existing public right of way. Much like what was indicated, that's been seen as the resident's property because nothing has occurred on it since the what, 1920's.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: Right, ever.

Mr. Shvezda: In regards to what improvements are necessary to resolve whatever really is determined to be the traffic issue, that is yet to be determined. Obviously, we have got, there's two lane wide Kemper Road from Forest Park, all the way to just to the west of Route 4 so we have got that issue and it may be more important to solve an issue at a major intersection then provide additional lanes throughout the whole length, we just don't know at this point.

Chairman Darby: Things to ponder. Anything else from the group?

Mr. Ramirez: Any update on Habanero's?

(Talking off mic. not audible)

Mr. Okum: Except their sign is crooked.

X. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Darby: By declaration we are adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_, 2018 \_\_\_\_\_  
Don Darby, Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_, 2018 \_\_\_\_\_  
Richard Bauer, Secretary