I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

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

II. ROLL CALL

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

Member Absent: Dave Okum

Staff Present: Carl Lamping, Building Official

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

IV. MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING ON MAY 12, 2020

Motion to adopt minutes made by Mr. Galster.

Mr. Hall seconded the motion.

Voice vote taken and the minutes were adopted by a vote of 5-0 with Meghan Sullivan-Wisecup abstaining.

V. REPORT ON COUNCIL

Report on City Council presented by Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup for the meeting held on June 17, 2020 and discussion among the Commission followed by the remaining report on the July 1, 2020 meeting.

VI. CORRESPONDENCE

- None

VII. OLD BUSINESS

A. Kleingers on behalf of Springdale Commerce Park, 12110 Princeton Pike, Springdale, Ohio, Minor Revision to a PUD – Record Plat (Application 36370) – Requested to table one more month.

Mr. Lamping addressed the Commission confirming that we have been in contact with the applicant and that the required Bonds for the project have been received and that the final details are being applied to the plat and that it is expected to be received in a couple of days so that we can take action on it in the August meeting.

Mr. Galster made a motion to table this item until the August 11, 2020 meeting.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup seconded the motion.

Secretary called the roll and the motion was approved to continue the application with a vote of 6 to 0 with one member absent.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

- None.
IX. DISCUSSION

Mr. Lamping requested general discussion of Compact Car Parking in the Zoning Code. Section 153.203(B)(2) of the code was provided as reference to the Commission members. Mr. Lamping requested clarification about the current code requirement of Planning Commission approval when the proposed project meets the 5 stated requirements. His understanding is that the Code should stand on its own, list the requirements and if it meets those, staff should be able to approve it. If it does not meet those 5 stated requirements, then the applicant must go to Planning Commission for a Variance for those requirements.

Mr. Galster brought up the wording of “may” being in the code section making it necessary to go to Planning Commission and that there is no definition to the compact car dimensions are listed.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup asked if there were dimensions or qualifications as to what a compact car is.

Chairman Darby brought up the rewriting of the policies and procedures that the City Planner did note that we could expect come back and revisit this code section many times. He recalled lots of discussion about what a compact car was.

Mr. Lamping clarified that the code is determining the requirements of compact car parking space, not the size of the car, noting that the compact parking space size is defined in the code section Item ‘d’.

There was discussion about what the size of a parking space was but that there is no vehicle size requirement for standard or compact.

Mr. Ramirez looked it up and stated that a compact car as defined by the EPA is having between 100 to 109 cu. ft. of combined passenger and cargo volume and that needs to be between 161 to 187 inches long.

Mr. Lamping did note that next month there will be a compact car parking layout for approval and that they are meeting all of the conditions as set forth and only coming to Planning Commission because the code states “and approval by Planning Commission.”

It was discussed that simply removing the words “and approved by Planning Commission” would eliminate the need to have Planning Commission look at every request unless they go outside of the guidelines set forth in the code. A couple of members made it known that they were in agreement with removing these words, and as long as the conditions of the code were met, they saw no need to have it reviewed by Planning Commission.

Discussion circled back to the wording of the code and what may need to be updated, changed or removed when they look at potential zoning code amendments in the future. Mr. Lamping thanked the Commission for the discussion.

Chairman Darby asked about any further discussion topics from the Commission.

Mr. Galster brought up discussion on the potential need for a definition of roadworthy vehicles parked in residential areas noting that he has recently had a situation where this was addressed and worked out but that a definition may assist in an enforcement toll going forward.

No further discussion was had at this point.
X. CHAIRMAN’S REPORT - None.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Diehl moved to adjourn.

Mr. Galster seconded the motion.

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

Respectfully submitted,

_____________________________________________, 2020

Don Darby, Chairman

_____________________________________________, 2020

Steve Galster, Secretary