

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

February 9, 2016

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: Richard Bauer, Don Darby, Tom Hall, Marjorie Harlow,
Lawrence Hawkins, Dave Okum, Joe Ramirez

Staff Present: Mrs. McBride, City Planner; Don Shvezgda, City Engineer;
Gregg Taylor, Building Official

III. MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF JANUARY 12, 2016

Chairman Darby: At this time the Chair will accept a motion to adopt the Minutes of our previous meeting of January 12th, 2016.

Mr. Hawkins: Move to adopt.

Mr. Hall seconded the motion. With seven "aye" votes from the Planning Commission Members, the January 12th, 2016 Minutes were adopted as submitted.

IV. REPORT ON COUNCIL

Mrs. Harlow provided a summary report of the January 20th, 2016 and the February 3rd, 2016 meetings of the City of Springdale City Council; the February 3rd meeting included a presentation for the new Zoning Code.

Chairman Darby: Thank you very much.

V. CORRESPONDENCE

Chairman Darby: There is correspondence that is in front of you but it will be built into the meeting.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

Chairman Darby: There are no items under Old Business.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Starbucks, 11700 Princeton Pike, Additional Illuminated Wall Signs

Chairman Darby: Representatives, please come forward. Good evening. It is our procedure that you give us a brief overview.

Ms. Tracie Gesel: I am Tracy Gesel (representing Atlantic Sign Company).

Mr. Tommy Reed: I am with Atlantic Sign Company.

Ms. Gesel: We are proposing to add two signs to the north elevation of this new Starbucks; it would be 71" diameter circular logo. There would also be a 13" X 59" drive-thru wall cabinet. We really want to allow this southbound traffic to be able to see the store sooner, there is no road sign that Starbucks is represented on here so cars traveling southbound really can't see the store until they are right in front of it or until they have passed it. That elevation is right at about 14,000 s.f. and the sign area is going to take up about 3% of that so we don't think that it is going to be all that intrusive to your sign code.

Mr. Reed: Tracie is with the national sign company and we are the local installer; we pull the permits. I just break down the things into what I know and I am a husband and a father; what does that have to do with the Starbucks sign? I imagine my wife in her mini-

van with five kids and she is coming down Princeton Pike and needs a cup of coffee, she is not going to know that there is a Starbucks there until she gets past it. If she gets her Starbucks on time that may save one or more lives of children in the car; when she gets her Starbucks on time she is happy and the kids can keep being chaotic and she knows where it is at and can find it easily. I believe that's the basis or the crux of our argument, is to give it the most visibility as possible from the traffic on the road. Also, I believe it would bring in more foot traffic or at least cars into the lot of Tri-County Mall; stop, have a cup of coffee and "Oh well, I might go check out a new pair of shoes". I don't see a downside to this argument and it would not hurt any neighboring business or member of the public in any way, shape or form.

Chairman Darby: It's good to see a presenter have such a vested interest.

Mrs. McBride: First off, I don't think I would get in a minivan with five kids. (Laughter)
(At this time Mrs. McBride presented the City Planner's comments concerning this request.)

Mrs. McBride: As obvious as it sounds, I am going to have to ask the two Members of Council, because it is a PUD and we are making a modification, to determine if it is a Minor Modification from the original plan.

Mrs. Harlow: In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, it is a Minor Modification.

Mr. Hawkins: I agree.

(Mr. Taylor and Mr. Shvegza had no additional comments.)

Chairman Darby: I will open it up for questions or comments.

Mrs. Harlow: I don't have a problem with the extra signage that they are requesting.

Mr. Okum: As far as the Starbucks emblem or the disk, I don't see a problem. I just need to verify that the drawing that was presented by the applicant showing the emblem on that side of the building is a true representation of the size of the emblem in proportion to that.

Mrs. McBride: I believe so, you can ask the applicant but I believe that it is. It is the same sign that is on the other two sides of the building.

Mr. Okum: The only thing that looks orphaned on that, that looks out of sync in my opinion is the word "drive-thru" in that box sign there. I think I would rather see that down over the canopy area; can that be done instead of it sort of floating around out there, it looks sort of odd – could you reply to that please?

Mr. Reed: That could be done but we really want to emphasize the point that there is a drive-thru. The lobby of that store isn't that large so they could be overrun by even fifty people in there.

Mr. Okum: I live in Springdale and I doubt greatly that your lobby would ever be overrun.

Mr. Reed: I understand but I guess what I am trying to emphasize is that the drive-thru cabinet needs to be as high as possible so that you have maximum viewing from the road. If you lower that 8' onto that canopy, you're not going to be able to see that drive-thru sign from the road from your car.

Mr. Okum: Is that an illuminated sign?

Mr. Reed: Yes.

Mr. Okum: You would certainly see it, based upon the photo that Staff provided. Now, I know that this photo that Staff took was taken from the parking lot but I drive over there pretty much every day and I can see that drive-thru canopy fairly well from the roadway.

Mr. Reed: Right; but my question is what if you don't drive through there every day; would you be able to readily see it if you weren't looking for it?

Mr. Okum: The first question is, is it a Starbucks? That is the most important thing for business. Let's see, I would like to hear comments from the rest of the Commission in regards to that.

Chairman Darby: The group is solid on it.

Ms. Gesel: May I ask, are you referring to the canopy that is directly over the drive-thru window?

Mr. Okum: Yes, I am. Yes, straight down almost in proportion to its center on that canopy; I mean it really designates that is the drive-thru so when someone is driving down and as you know the roadway grade goes up at that point, so you are basically looking up at that building, you would get a real good shot at that drive-thru and it sort of draws your eyes to it. It doesn't mean that there is functionally a drive-thru; there is a drive-thru right there and you would see the canopy virtually bringing your eye to that as an item that you would see going down the road. That is my only criticism because if you look at it, the drawing that you submitted, it really looks sort of out of sync. It is balanced but it is just a box sign sort of sitting out there in the middle of the field.

Mr. Hall: I have the same concerns with this. With the Starbucks logo, the size that it is on the north side of that building, anyone on the southbound of Princeton Road which I am very familiar with it also, would be able to see the drive-thru and the drive-thru is very well marked other than just being a drive-thru on the north side of the building. I think it wouldn't be advantageous to have the sign underneath the logo that says "drive-thru". If it is, it would be complimented on the drive-thru partition that is already in place there, to indicate it. If you are pulling in there from the southbound point of State Route 747 then you are going to see the drive-thru or at least I am able to see it and I don't think I would need a big sign of that size to tell me that underneath here is the drive-thru.

Mr. Hawkins: I think quite frankly I could go either way with it but I think the comments you have heard from Mr. Okum and Mr. Hall are very true to whatever you are trying to get done. I don't think traffic going southbound on 747 is necessarily going to be focusing on the drive-thru sign as much as they are going to be looking for the Starbucks logo and if the drive-thru is lowered down to the canopy it is going to have a much more practical use for when the vehicle gets back around to see where they are going to get into the drive-thru. I understand what you guys are trying to do and I understand the idea of putting it up higher to try to increase visibility. I think, from a practical standpoint the size of the drive-thru sign traveling on 747 going southbound is probably going to have a nominal impact in terms of that. The real thing they are going to be looking at is the Starbucks emblem and when they get back there closer to see where their actual drive-thru is it will be a little more helpful.

Ms. Gesel: I would note that canopy is more than 13" tall so the sign may extend above it; is that going to be a problem?

Mrs. Harlow: It won't look good.

Mrs. McBride: The signs are not allowed to extend above the roofline; it is a PUD so Planning Commission could approve that modification but you would want to include that in any motion that you made.

Mrs. Harlow: My question to the young lady, is this something that is coming down from corporate and what do you do at other location; do you have the drive-thru right under the logo at the other locations?

Ms. Gesel: The reason that they put it right under the siren is because not all Starbucks are drive-thru Starbucks so that is why they want the drive-thru sign right with their logo.

Mrs. Harlow: That makes sense.

Ms. Gesel: They want the customers to know that this one is a drive-thru location.

Mrs. Harlow: And I think if you are a loyal Starbucks customer, I am sorry I am not because it is a little bit too strong for me, but if you were a loyal Starbucks customer, then you would probably know those little details of what store was a drive-thru and which ones weren't.

Mr. Bauer: I will repeat a lot, I guess but to me the drive-thru sign is too small and you are not going to see it driving by there. I would agree to put it down on that canopy but to me you would have to modify the sign so it is not bigger than that edge of that canopy because I wouldn't want it extending above that either. It seems out of place, to me, where it is at and you are not really going to see it; it is going to be hard to draw attention to, I believe. Thank you.

Mr. Okum: I think you have heard pretty much the feelings of the Commission. Is there a willingness for you as the Applicant representing Starbucks to make that change?

Ms. Gesel: Yes. We could definitely move it.

Mr. Okum: I think we all would agree that we don't want it larger than the canopy but certainly you can adjust the sign size to what it needs to be.

Ms. Gesel: Smaller than 13" would make it pointless.

Mr. Reed: That is my question.

Mr. Okum: Do you know what the size of the canopy is?

Mr. Reed: Not right off hand. My question is that Mr. Bauer has stated that he thinks, as shown, that the drive-thru cabinet is too small. So, let's say that we have to shrink it more to put it on the canopy; you are telling me that I can put it on the canopy but it will be too small to be seen. I am trying to understand and think through this.

Mr. Okum: Mr. Hall spoke that he felt that the drive-thru is an obvious element to the building façade, which is clearly obvious to the driving traffic going down. So, whether you have the drive-thru sign on the canopy there or not, according from what I heard from Mr. Hall, it is not going to make any difference because you can see the drive-thru itself when you are driving. In regards to additional items on signage, I did visit that store twice now and the directional from the parking field needs some help, it is sort of awkward to get to that drive-thru and know where you are supposed to navigate to. Maybe some lot directional signs might help that site as well for the drive-thru use. Maybe they are there but I didn't see them.

Mr. Reed: They are there.

Mr. Okum: It is hard to navigate because you go in at one spot and then you have to sort of serpentine around to get to the drive-thru which is really weird.

Mr. Reed: Maybe if they were larger you would see them.

Mr. Okum: There are standards for what you can have as far as directional parking lot signage; it is in our Zoning Code and you can live up to that. You may be a little bit smaller than what is allowed or you may be larger, but I doubt it. In my opinion, I agree with Mr. Hall, if you are going to have the drive-thru sign then you put it on the canopy and if you are not then I will go with what Mr. Bauer suggested that with the size of the canopy then you can do without it, as far as I am concerned. I want you to succeed of course and obviously I don't think this is a make-it or break-it item but the emblem alone is a pretty good element and I think it is important that it is there, I don't disagree and I am supporting that part of it completely.

Ms. Gesel: The front and rear elevations have the size cabinet, so it might look awkward with the symmetry.

Mr. Okum: I don't think so. As a matter of fact I don't pay a lot of attention to the front signage even though I drive by there a lot, it doesn't draw me in to that. I know that there is a drive-thru there like Mr. Hall said you can see the drive-thru element in itself on the south side, it is just tying that drive-thru onto that sign I think is very important.

Chairman Darby: Staff, would you like to comment on that question?

Ms. McBride: I didn't, as Staff, have any problem with it as they were proposing it.

Chairman Darby: I mean the most recent question about the similarity in the size?

Ms. McBride: I don't know that you would see all three sides at one time, so I don't have a problem with that, you might see two and the one on the backside I am not quite sure exactly what good that does but again we don't regulate that backside of the building.

Chairman Darby: Okay, Mr. Okum.

Mr. Okum: Chairman, I would like to make a motion and this will be at the discretion of the applicant, of course, they can either do the product or maybe resubmit if they wish. I move that we approve the signage on the north elevation of the out lot building for the Starbucks facility; this condition as presented in their section drawing provided to Staff prior to this meeting, the only condition is that the drive-thru with the little arrow sign component must be placed on the canopy over the drive-thru, if the applicant wishes to use it and that element shall be no larger than the canopy site.

(Mr. Hall seconded the motion.)

Chairman Darby: It has been moved and seconded that the submittal be approved as indicated in the motion.

(Mr. Bauer polled Planning Commission members, and with a 7 - 0 vote, the motion was approved.)

B. Concept Plan Review, 15-Acre Site Northwest Boulevard at Pictoria Drive

Chairman Darby: Would the representatives please come forward.

Mr. Jeff Tulloch: It's good to be back on the dark side. My name is Jeff Tulloch, with Southport Associates of Lebanon, Ohio and I am representing Van Trust Real Estate, the proponent on this project. After my forty-five minute presentation, I will be turning it over to Tyler and then Ryan. Tyler will tell you about who Van Trust is as a developer; Ryan is going to talk more specifics of the project. We wanted to come in as Concept Review verses simply submitting an application to get some feedback from the Planning Commission as to the Planning Commissions attitude toward the modification of the development, which is really a use change from office to industrial. What the project involves is a building of approximately 230,000 plus square feet on a fifteen-acre site immediately behind Pictoria, right on Northwest Boulevard. The aggregate area of Pictoria is a PUD and the specific site is designated for office use under the PUD. As such, the PUD would need to be modified and probably a Major Modification since it is a use change to permit the industrial use which is proposed. The rationale that we have that would perhaps validate the change, number one the surrounding area of this site is predominantly industrial, not putting an industrial building in a commercial park or residential area because it is really substantially, by character, an industrial area. Number two, in my experience as the predecessor to Christine Russell as Development Director, we had very few opportunities, one opportunity to present to a company for office use and some of the members might recall as Ta Ta Consulting, an East Indian group and really there was marginal interest. Fundamentally it is a good industrial site, not necessarily a good office, in our view. The site has historically been either vacant or agricultural with relatively low productivity from a tax standpoint. Somebody mentioned to me that nothing has happened with the site for the last ten years and I said that technically, nothing has happened with the site for the site for the last 4.5B years, the life of the earth,

because nothing has ever happened there; it has been vacant or agricultural - that was the most positive use that it has obtained. We estimate, and I think Christine may have some more definitive numbers, but we estimate that the site at its employment would generate somewhere in the neighborhood of \$200,000 to \$500,000 a year in annual earnings tax payments. The variation there would be from industrial at \$200,000 a year, and I forget the exact ratios that I used, up to E-Commerce type of use which is higher in employment and would be closer to the \$500,000 a year. So it would be economically attractive to the City and lastly, it would help cover the minimum service payments that have been paid by the buyer's steel company which the minimum service payments on the TIFF which actually paid for Northwest Boulevard. I can't remember the definitive numbers but it has been \$100,000 plus a year in cost to buyer's steel to cover that minimum service payment; the tax generation from this would cover that minimum service payment. Its' intent, Van Trust has submitted an Application for the PUD Modification as early as early March and we wanted to go through the Concept Plan Review to get feedback from the Planning Commission as to how they felt about the use change from office to industrial. If there are any questions for me I will welcome them; barring that, I will turn it over to Tyler to talk about Van Trust.

Mr. Tyler Ford: Van Trust is a commercial real estate developer. We have developed industrial, office and multi-family properties across the country. We were headquartered in Kansas City, Missouri and we have offices in Phoenix, Dallas, Houston, Jacksonville, Florida; and our Columbus office, which Ryan and I established. We have a very active interest in the Cincinnati market. In northern Kentucky, we completed a 274,000 s.f. industrial warehouse in 2015 which was 100% leased to UPS distribution. We also are currently under construction for 674,000 s.f. industrial warehouse in northern Kentucky as well. Recently we broke ground in Blue Ash for a 140,000 s.f. office building and we purchased the neighboring office buildings adjacent to that. In Columbus, we have a 700,000 s.f. industrial building and a building in Grove City, which is very similar to the one that we are proposing here which is 226,000 s.f. that is currently 100% leased. That was a very successful project and we still currently own that. Van Trust portfolio, up to last year we had about 4,000,000 s.f. in industrial warehouse space and we intend to make a significant investment in Cincinnati on top of what we have already done; we plan to stay here in relationship in the future. I will turn it over to Ryan now and he will speak more about the building itself.

Mr. Ryan Lidke: I am with Van Trust. Does everyone have a color packet? I want to discuss the rendering here. As Jeff had mentioned, we are proposing a 235,000 s.f. industrial. You could use the word flex, if you will, we kind of keep the flexibility for our end user types; a single loading building, we are proposing, with all the entrances off the front of Northwest Boulevard. The corner elements will kind of create an office space with the flex user and keep the flexibility to have a multi-tenant or a single tenant as an option. Considering that location, the existing building, keeping the exterior façade and keeping the Pictoria building in mind with that when coming up with this rendering to accommodate that with the colors and the variations of those. The exterior of the building is a pre-cast building, very similar to the Pictoria building across the street. As you can see in the back, we have put in some screening; we talked to Staff about that previously in early discussions, screening the rear of the building there off of the Avon parcel. If you will, turn to second page showing a floor plan. In this design, our parking ratios are higher than our typical layout. Tyler mentioned when we did in Columbus, the 225,000 s.f. in Grove City, the parking ratio is a little higher here. Jeff had mentioned the E-Commerce; we're hoping and looking for more employee parking, is our overall intent on this one. Patrick, with Kleingers Group, we're anticipating retention ponds, obviously we have a placeholders for those right now until we get further design. Our current design is showing a retention pond in the front and the back of the property, currently. On the next page, it shows the grading plan and shows the topography in the current condition as well as the proposed. You have the two entrances off of Northwest Boulevard and what kind of dedicated truck entrance and the other one would be public vehicular entrance. The next page, I believe, is an early elevation design of all four sides, proposing a 32' clear height. Any questions or comments at this point?

Chairman Darby: We will move on to Staff input now. Mrs. McBride?

Mrs. McBride: As the Commission knows, it is a PUD, so the two Members of Council will need to determine whether or not this is a Major or Minor Change. I think the current language in our Code in Section 153.448 indicates that, if there is a major departure from the substance of the Preliminary Development Plan, which was for three buildings of office use, that it likely is a major departure and you may want to go ahead and take that vote decision tonight so that the direction is clearly given to the Applicant.

Mrs. Harlow: My feeling is it is a Major Change going from office building to industrial office space.

Mr. Hawkins: I would agree that is a major departure.

Chairman Darby: Two for two; you're on a roll.

Mrs. McBride then provided City Planner's comments.

Mrs. McBride: The other thing that I did want to mention is, based on the timing of this submission, I believe this will be our first application under our new Zoning Code so we will want to make sure that we work with the Applicant and that they have that new Code and that they are able to use that in their design and I am sure they will find that much more user friendly than our current Code.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Mr. Taylor?

Mr. Taylor provided the Building Official's comments.

Chairman Darby: Thank you.

Mr. Shvegzda provided the City Engineer's comments.

Mrs. McBride: Just one additional comment - the Applicant is going to want to review the covenants for the Pictoria PUD to make sure that if they need to be modified that the draft of those modifications are submitted with the Preliminary Development Plan, so that they can be reviewed by Planning Commission, Council, and the Law Director.

Mr. Okum: Based upon Staff's provision to us of the original Phase I, Phase II, and Phase III of the PUD, this encompasses, just so we understand, the entire area where the three office buildings were originally drafted; is that correct?

Mr. Ford: Correct.

Mr. Okum: All the way up to General Packaging, or whatever they are?

Mr. Ford: Yes.

Mr. Okum: Will any of the water be going into what I call, where the beaver lives in this swamp area by Showcase Cinemas? Will it go west or will it go south; which way will the water flow?

Mr. Shvegzda: The water discharges into the, all of this eventually goes into the detention basin that is to the north, on the east side of Northwest Boulevard, but it is designed to pass through there. There is a culvert and I think it discharges to the west of Northwest Boulevard.

Mr. Okum: So if I'm on Northwest Boulevard and I go to the west side of Northwest Boulevard, there is a basin area or low area, is that the area where the water goes to?

Mr. Shvegzda: I believe so; I would have to take a look back at that.

Mr. Okum: Because there is a beaver habitat there and there has been some clearing of trees and beavers have been very active in blocking that and that whole basin is filling with water. I think there is a scout project ongoing there now because I saw them out

there the other day. One day I saw water cascading onto Crescentville Road and I called the City Maintenance and I said that I think we have a water main break, it turned out that it was that the dam broke loose and all the water was going out at one time. We just need to be aware of that because there may need to be some clean up that is tied to provisions of that whole development that needs to be done.

Chairman Darby: Are you advocating a beaver relocation project?

Mr. Okum: No. I like beavers; they are okay. Getting into the detention basins, these are going to be active with water in them, correct? I would want to see on the drawings and my recommendation for them would be for them to be aerated especially with the ongoing issues with mosquitos and mosquito habitats and so forth; water sitting there stagnant is mosquito havens. I have the same concerns as Staff in regards to, I guess, what would be the north parking field with trucks coming in to the bay area. Possibly, and I don't know how much property you have, is there no property that you could that you could sort of gather and get a roadway in there that holds the parking on the other side, and get a roadway that would tie the connection into the north property across that north section there? Instead of the parking field being where it is at, move and put a roadway in coming down through there that would tie you into the Avon property off of Northwest Boulevard; just a thought.

Mr. Ford: Okay, sure. Absolutely.

Mr. Okum: In regards to the building elevations, that type of building elevation is very popular, the colors are great; I know this is preliminary but it is a nice direction to go. Possibly in those two center sections between the bays, have some break in the building elevation. I know you are doing upright panels but you can do offsets on those to bring some definition and shadowing over those big wide open areas; just changing your depth on your panels to give that break. That, I think, would be helpful. Besides it being industrial verses office, I understand the economics of the use. The best laid plans you can design however you want to design it but the market is going to drive whatever happens to it. Sometimes you understand the plan may evolve. I would not be surprised that Council, once it goes to them would understand our reasoning for a change but there is obviously a reason that Council and our PUD standards are set the way they are, so that Council does get final approval on the work that we do. Hopefully we do our work good and Council can move it through and your project can move forward.

Chairman Darby: Do you have any initial predictions as to what the breakout might be, for the office or the warehousing?

Mr. Ford: It depends on the users. We can see 5% of the building being office, but it can be up to 10% set aside for office but it's designed to have that flexibility depending on the users to attract a broader base of potential tenants.

Mr. Taylor: Just to follow-up on the beaver situation, if you will, we are aware of the problem. Actually, there are orders pending right now with the operator of the theater. The reason the trees were cleared, some of the trees were actually potentially going to fall on our fiber optic line so there was some urgency in getting those down. Obviously they have to clean up and they have two or three times tried to deal with the vermin situation, unfortunately with not a lot of success. They keep trying to hire somebody to come out there and get rid of them. But it is an ongoing problem and we are aware of it and we are trying to manage that.

Mr. Okum: Honestly I did not know there were active beavers in our area.

Mr. Taylor: Yes, there are.

Mrs. Harlow: In following up on Mr. Okum's comment, because it is a major change to a PUD, I can't speak for the rest of Council but I am very pleased to have you here this evening with your Concept Plan Review. You have brought in a lot of information and I think you have got a lot of information from this Panel on what they would like to see when you come in with your application. I would be very surprised if Council would not

totally approve moving forward with what you want. We are very much aware that we want to draw new businesses in and we want to work with the new businesses when they come in to make sure that they feel welcome and at home here in Springdale. Thank you for coming in this evening.

Mr. Bauer: I, too, am glad you're here, having the opportunity to look at the concept. Staff has done a great job, as always, putting together kind of an outline of what to look for and I think you should take those comments and outline to heart and look at those and provide the information that is requested and required. My button issues is the Traffic Study - I am curious to see what that says and how we deal with that; storm water is also another big one. I look forward to your Preliminary Plan. Thank you.

Chairman Darby: I come from world where we are always concerned about attractive nuisances, that is a rather large retention pond there, right?

Mr. Patrick Warnement: I am from Kleingers Group. The preliminary calculations to include water quality and standard retention, we needed somewhere in the neighborhood of 93,000 cubic feet of storage. What you see there on the Northwest Boulevard side is about 78,000 or 79,000 cubic feet; the remainder would be achieved on the southeast portion of the site.

Chairman Darby: My question had to do with, and maybe this is an industry standard issue, but some of our more rambunctious children in that area - do you ever see a need to put a restraining feature around a pond that large?

Mr. Warnement: We usually only run into that on steep slopes, as opposed to safety but if there is a safety concern, that is certainly something that we could look at but we don't encounter that very often. I think earlier there may have been, and just to clarify, this is intended to be a dry pond, not a wet pond.

Chairman Darby: Oh, so this is dry?

Mr. Warnement: Yes. Unless somebody really wants pond full of water.

Chairman Darby: You just invalidated my question, thank you.

Mr. Warnement: Right. So the mosquitos, and hopefully not geese, hopefully that part of it helps but it is dry and it is made to draw down in 72 hours.

Chairman Darby: Okay, thank you. Other comments, folks?

Mr. Hall: I have a two-part question. Is Van Trust LLC the builder and developer of this? How much leasing have they secured to make sure this is a successful project and that it isn't just abandoned after it is built? Thank you.

Mr. Ford: Van Trust would be the developer. We would hire a general contractor to build it. As far as the leasing, it would be a completely speculative project. The vacancy rate for industrial warehouse is below 10% across Greater Cincinnati, as with Class A space. So we are expecting that, as we have with our other projects, the activity will be very positive and there would be great interest in this. The brokerage community is already very aware that Van Trust has a significant interest and has already invested significant dollars in preparing this presentation and negotiating with the current owner. So there is a lot of activity out there in regards to this project in particular and that is why we are here tonight, to get your feedback and get this project going as soon as we can.

Mr. Hall: Thank you. You indicated that you had a project over in Blue Ash that was leased. Out of curiosity, before you would start development on this project, what percentage of the 235,000 s.f. would be a break even part so that you would be able to go ahead with the project; committed to?

Mr. Lidke: Just to clarify, the project in Blue Ash is 145,000 s.f. office building which is going vertical currently, with anticipation of turning over and occupying in November of

this year. If I understand you correctly, overlap between this project and that project, am I correct?

Mr. Hall: No, the Blue Ash project was just because it was in close proximity. The question is what percentage of the 235,000 s.f. of this project would have to be committed by a tenant before you would go forward with the project?

Mr. Lidke: Given a speculative project, we would go vertical right away.

Mr. Hall: So it could be zero?

Mr. Lidke: It could be zero, it could be 100% and it could be 50%.

Mr. Okum: You have an option on the property, is there a timeline that is critical to your closing on the deal that we need to be aware of?

Mr. Ford: No, no. We are more concerned in getting the building right first. The current owner is aware of that, that we are working through the process and they have been very helpful with our process. We are not on any constrained time limits, as far as that goes on the business side. On the market side, we feel like it is a great opportunity right now with few buildings going vertical right now with the leasing activity in Monroe, with the industrial buildings that other developers are doing, that this is a great time to build a project like this because the activity is there.

Mrs. Harlow: Do you need this Board to move our meetings around to make any adjustments for you, for your timeframe that you are working on?

Mr. Ford: Not at this moment. We have kind of scheduled everything that we have to handle on completing the closing around your meetings so we are fine from that standpoint.

Mrs. Harlow: Well, if you do, then I would really ask that you request from Mr. Darby, a special meeting. I think that we would have to have a special notice of that - seventy-two hours in advance or something like that. We would certainly not want to hold you up if we can avoid that.

Mr. Ford: Great, thank you.

Chairman Darby: Mrs. Harlow and other Members, timing was an item of discussion between Staff and the developers and I believe we are on a schedule now that is going to meet their needs along with our schedule but of course at any time a special meeting would become necessary then I am sure we would be able to work that out also.

Mr. Ford: Great, thank you.

Chairman Darby: Anything else from the group? (None.) We look forward to working with you.

Mr. Ford: Thank you very much.

Mr. Lidke: We appreciate it.

VIII. DISCUSSION

Mr. Okum: Hamilton County Regional Planning Commission typically and consistently reviews the township zoning requests for changes to their Zoning Code. As you know, most townships have the opportunity and control, like Mrs. McBride who lives in Anderson Township and serves on the Zoning Commission for Anderson Township, they approved their own Zoning Code. We had an interesting submission last Thursday at the Regional Planning Commission Meeting that I thought we should be aware of. Colerain Township is the largest township in State of Ohio and they requested approval for a change to their Zoning Code to allow trash containers to be

placed in the front of the residences, which is very unusual. As a Township, they are putting trash containers and the large rolling trash containers and large rolling recycling containers on every property in their whole Township; they brokered a deal.

Chairman Darby: You don't mean for pick up?

Mr. Okum: Oh yes. You can have your container up against the front of the house 24/7, seven days a week. Our Zoning Code does not currently permit that and I am not encouraging it, as a matter of fact I voted against it. I think it establishes a terrible precedent and I told them that. It makes it also pretty difficult for them to deal with businesses that want to put their dumpster containers and their containers of trash in the front of those businesses, as well, when they have I don't know how many thousands of residences in their Township. I did want to bring it to our Commission's attention since we are approving a new Zoning Code. I see Mrs. McBride's eyes and your light is on; you want to comment about this?

Mrs. McBride: I do. I think that our existing Code and I think the new Code are both silent on the locations of trash cans for residential use. I think that is a Property Maintenance Code here in the City of Springdale that deals with that. We do obviously cover location of commercial dumpsters, multi-family dumpsters and those kinds of things. I think the existing and the new Code are silent on that.

Mr. Okum: This is another point that was brought to the Commission's knowledge, was that the reason for the change in the Code is that there are certain residents that complained to the Administration regarding people leaving their garbage cans out in front of their place. It is an annoyance and a very hard thing to manage.

Mr. Taylor: It is a difficult problem to manage and we write an unbelievable number of trash receptacle violations through the Property Maintenance Code. There was actually some discussion among Staff about the possibility of doing roll-off containers and really the problem with the roll-out type is that there is no place to put them in a lot of our neighborhoods. So, that is one of the reasons that I think it was nixed as part of the negotiations with the waste collection people. Point well taken; yes it is an enforcement nightmare but I think it has been reaffirmed by the leadership of the City that we don't want them in the front yard.

Mr. Thamann: Just to add, regarding our contract with Rumpke with the consortium with the Center for Local Government, there are five communities that went out for bids together, Springdale elected the option of subscription recycling. If we went with straight-out recycling, Rumpke was going to deliver I think a 38-gallon, which is shorter than the regular garbage bin but it is thinner but tall. The problem we focused on is where is the resident going to store it. We already have enough complaints just with the garbage cans along for the containers they use. So we went to subscription only, if a resident wants a recycle bin they can go ahead and order it and have it delivered by Rumpke. They are making a determination that they have a place to store it. We weren't going to force it upon all the residents to get a recycling bin and then they have to struggle with where to put it; they can't fit it in their garage, they have no room on the side or they have to build a fence or some enclosure to keep it. So, we said no, we are going to stay with the 18-gallon bin and you can get a second bin if you want.

Mr. Okum: Those little red bins don't hold anything. I am actually using an extension on mine that makes it taller to accommodate more recycling because I recycle more than I trash.

Mr. Thamann: Did you not hear what I said, you can get another one?

Mr. Okum: I understand that and thank you. They took my second one away once.

Mr. Thamann: I will give you one; I will take it out of my garage.

Mr. Okum: Two other items; March 11th is the Planning Partnership Annual Meeting, 11:00 a.m. at Blue Ash Golf Course. Springdale is a consistent member of the Planning Partnership and is active in the organization. Another item of information is that I had an opportunity to visit a restaurant up at Liberty Town Center; very nice, mostly empty, but they have hopes for growth. Liberty Township, I noticed on my bill when I paid my bill that there was an additional 0.05% tax charged to me. Anything you buy at that mall, gets an additional 0.05% on your entertainment

in Liberty Township. Shopping in Springdale, you save 0.05% by going to Tri-County Mall, which I have been walking in recently and I would love to see some more stores internally. But I have also been walking in Forest Fair Mall or Cincinnati Mills Mall and it is a walking track for all of those people that want to walk. If you want a walking area, Forest Fair Mall is heated and it is covered.

Chairman Darby: And no stores to interfere with your walking.

Mr. Okum: No stores. That is all I have.

Chairman Darby: I would like to thank Staff for having presented a wonderful meeting involving Planning Commission and BZA a couple of weeks ago. Very informative and when I see something like that I think it should become like a tradition. Also, I want to thank Mrs. McBride and her company for the part they played in the Planning Conference out at Anderson a couple of weeks ago, also a very, very good event.

Mrs. Harlow: In response to Mr. Okum and the Liberty Center and the tax, there are also parking meters, and I don't think we have a single parking meter in Springdale. They do have parking meters there.

Mr. Okum: The parking meters, all the money goes to charity.

Mrs. Harlow: It is still parking meters.

Mr. Okum: They give friendly tickets; it is not administered by the local police.

IX. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

(No report.)

X. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Darby: We will accept a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Okum moved to adjourn. Mr. Hall seconded the motion and the City of Springdale Planning Commission meeting concluded at 8:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

_____, 2016 _____
Don Darby, Chairman

_____, 2016 _____
Richard Bauer, Secretary