

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

July 12, 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: Anne McBride, City Planner; Don Shvegza, City Engineer;
Gregg Taylor, Building Official

III. MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF JUNE 14th, 2016

Chairman Darby: At this time, the Chair will accept a motion to adopt the Minutes of our previous meeting of June 14th, 2016.

Mr. Okum: Move to adopt.

Mr. Hall seconded the motion. Mr. Hawkins advised that he was not present at the time that the minutes from the May 10th, 2016 meeting were adopted, and requested that the minutes from the June 14th, 2016 meeting be updated to reflect the correct number of votes as 6-0. The minutes from the June 14th, 2016 were otherwise adopted with a 7-0 vote.

IV. REPORT ON COUNCIL

Mrs. Harlow: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Council met on June 15th, and this was our meeting that we had our Committee and Official Reports. Nothing major to report on there. We did have a public hearing. We had six members of Council present for that meeting, and it was adopting the tax budget for the City of Springdale for the year January 1st, 2017 through December 31st, 2017, and that passed with a 6-0 vote. And that would conclude my report. Thank you.

Chairman Darby: Thank you very much. Mr. Okum.

Mr. Okum: I might as well ask now. Residents are asking me questions. What happened to the crane?

Mrs. Harlow: Okay, I could answer that if Mr. Chairman, if I may?

Chairman Darby: Sure.

Mrs. Harlow: I also asked Mr. Parham that question, and we're talking about the crane up at the old Sheraton Hotel, and we have a contract with O'Rourke Construction for demolition of the hotel. The hotel had some asbestos in it, and this was going to be handled with a purchase order through Administration because it was going to be under \$50,000, and that's something that Administration can do without having to come to Council, and as they dug deeper into the inside of the hotel, they found more asbestos. This was going to be a much larger ticket item, which is going to require that they go out for bid, and it will have to come before Council for a vote. So until Administration gets all the details worked out on that, and goes out to bid on it and gets it to Council, we're kind of dead in the water waiting for that to happen because for the safety of all the workers, asbestos has to be removed before they can do the crane. Is that my understanding? Okay.

Chairman Darby: Great. Any other questions on that issue? Thank you.

V. CORRESPONDENCE

Chairman Darby: We have no correspondence this week.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

There was no Old Business to discuss.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Outback Steakhouse, 11700 Princeton Pike, Outspace 2. Minor Revisions to Improve PUD. #30610.

Chairman Darby: Representatives, please come forward. Representative. Good evening. How are you?

Mr. Forte: Good evening. How are you?

Chairman Darby: Fine.

Mr. Forte: Good evening. My name is Brent Forte. Address is 6001 Nimitz Parkway, and that's in South Bend, Indiana, 46628. My company, Site Enhancement Services, the application was filed by Shawn Smith. I work with Shawn Smith, but again, my name is Brent Forte. We focus specifically on zoning and exterior signage and obtaining approvals, whether it's by meeting with the Commission as well applying for permits. We've performed these duties for Bloomin' Brands as well as many other clients for new buildings and remodels over the last nine years, and I have been qualified as an expert in our chosen field by many different land use and appeals boards. AS mentioned, we're here to discuss Outback relocation, which will be located at 11700 Princeton Pike, and we feel that this request would bring clear communication to this site as well as the building itself. Now, I do want to go over, there was a letter by Anne McBride, City Planner. We do agree with the information in there; it's still correct. We are proposing the same signage that was represented on the elevations that was shown previously to the Commission. We are not providing or proposing a wall sign on the rear elevation. We thought that the main focus should be on the three main elevations to identify the site, due to the grade change and the vegetation, but if that is a preference of the Commission as well as City Staff, we're not opposed to it. I know there were some issues that may need to be discussed with the landlord a little bit further, but if that's something we can add, we would be glad to do.

Chairman Darby: Let me comment on that, if I may, and other members may like to. Believe me, we are not a group through which it's easy to get requests for signage. So, when there's a recommendation that you add signage, it's pretty well founded, and I think that Administration's approach to this is, we would, it's preferable that we not just have that blank wall.

Mr. Forte: Understood.

Chairman Darby: Plus, for people who are within the area of the center, it really mush serves, pretty much serves as a directional sign, because you don't really know what that is if you're directly in back of it. That was the thinking on that. Dave, would you? So that's where were coming from.

Mr. Forte: Okay, I appreciate that. Thank you.

Chairman Darby: But feel very, very rare, because we don't usually react that way.

Mr. Forte: I understand. That's, we were looking at the outparcel and since it's not visible from the right-of-way, we're not opposed to it either, we just only want to propose what's necessary to not create clutter and only something that's required to identify the site.

Chairman Darby: Thank you.

Mr. Forte: Ah, let's see here. We also do want to request, or I'd like to request that this request would be deemed minor. I know that that has to be deemed minor from the two Council members.

Chairman Darby: Could we get the two Council members to comment on that at this time that this would be a minor...

Mr. Hawkins: I think it's a minor modification.

Chairman Darby: We're in agreement then.

Mr. Forte: Thank you very much. Okay and again, the total square footage, there are a total of five wall signs that are being proposed; three main wall signs and two signs that we consider ancillary where they identify the take-out as well as the main entrance to the building for our customers. I do have additional artwork that's an 11"x17", if any of the Commission would like to have extra copies. I know that you should have been provided copies. Just to make sure everybody has copies.

Chairman Darby: We have been.

Mr. Forte: Okay. Now if I could have you flip through the first page. Page two shows our site plan as well as the location of all of our signs that we are proposing. Again, signs A,C, and E are all six, approximately 66 square feet. Those are our main identifiers that are the (unintelligible) and our logo; and then signs B and D are the ancillary signs that are 7.8 square feet each on two of the elevations. The following page is an aerial view, page three, and that shows the different travel paths that can access to the site. Again, obviously this is an outparcel, which this location is, and this is my opinion based off of traveling the site, looking at the grade changed and the vegetation. It is difficult to see, I understand there are free-standing signs out there for opportunities for tenant panels, but in my opinion, the building needs to have adequate wall signage that so you can see as a motorist heading along Princeton Pike from each elevation, because whether you're heading southbound or northbound, or you're coming from within the shopping center, or butting the shopping center, each wall sign serves a purpose and in most scenarios, two wall signs at the same time are not visible. So I wanted to include that page for the different travel paths. Now the following path is again that elevations are the same. We feel that the request is within the intent of the ordinance because each wall sign is under the four percent that is allowed for the main identification, or main elevation, however, we understand that the two side elevations do not front an additional roadway per se. We're a corner parcel. But we're hoping that would be considered still within the intent because they are three and a half percent on two of the elevations, and then the total sign area for the other elevation takes up about three point three percent of the total façade area. If there is any additional questions as far as the sign material make, I've gone through the artwork and we feel that this request will provide the legibility needed for the advance notification along Princeton Pike. We feel that this will, the positives and what it will do for the motorists in the shopping center will significantly outweigh any negatives that may be brought be approving this proposal, and that this time I'm willing to answer any questions you may have.

Chairman Darby: We'll go with our Staff comments and then we'll get back around to that.

Mr. Forte: Thank you, sir.

Chairman Darby: Thanks for your presentation. Ms. McBride.

Ms. McBride: Thank you. This, the Outback was originally approved by this Commission on September 8th of last year, and that approval specifically indicated that it was not an approval of any signage at that time, so the applicant has come back in with signage and it is consistent with the conceptual plans that we saw last September. He ran through the numbers. Staff doesn't really have a problem with the additional signage on the north and the south elevations. One of the things that we had looked at and decided not to do in the new code was to try to make some provisions for allowing signage on major, what we would call private drives, entrances for example into the mall. Whereas that's not a

public street, it certainly serves a similar type function, and then on the south elevation you know we have a lot of traffic going north so I think that that's appropriate. The one comment that we made here which the applicant touched on was the inclusion of, as the Chair said, "Oh my gosh! I'm recommending extra signage!" I did that one other time I think at Wendy's, but that rear elevation is very stark without any signage and the original package that we did see last September did have a sign on that elevation, so I would suggest that perhaps that be included on that. I think it makes it look less like a rear, like a back of a restaurant if it has some signage on it and I think the 66.9 square foot Outback that they have is not a large sign. It's not intrusive or whatever. The two members of the Planning Commission and on Council have already deemed this to be a minor modification which is what Staff has suggested, so if you had any other questions, I would be happy to answer those.

Chairman Darby: I believe that concludes our Staff comments for this particular submission. Mr. Okum.

Mr. Okum: Ms. McBride, just one question. Are you suggesting that the sign be up to 66.9 square feet on the rear?

Ms. McBride: Yeah, cause that's what they originally had shown us and it's just that simple Outback with the little bit of logo and that fits nicely on that rear elevation, so.

Mr. Okum: Okay. Does the applicant have any problem with accommodating that request of Staff and if so, this Commission may vote that way.

Mr. Forte: We do not. Obviously we still have to get landlord approval just in case they have an issue, and just, if any of the Commission would like I do have a picture on the elevation drawings if they would like to see that.

Mr. Okum: That's sort of where I thought it would go.

Mr. Forte: We don't have an issue with the addition of that sign.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Hawkins: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. With regard to the rear elevation and the sign that's going to go back there, where is that going to be if I'm looking at page seven to ten? We have those three, I assume there's like rain gutters. Would it be to the left or the right or?

Mr. Forte: It would be to the left.

Mr. Hawkins: Okay.

Mr. Okum: Between the two downspouts.

Mr. Hawkins: That open space, right there. Excellent. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Darby: I don't see any other requests for comment or questions, so I believe we're ready for a motion.

Mr. Okum: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion to approve Outback Steakhouse's request, Case # 30610, to include specification designs contained in the exhibits as submitted and reviewed by Staff prior to this meeting, to include our City Planner's considerations in this motion, and also that the additional Outback sign be placed on the rear for the building to identify the business operation, up to 66.9 square feet.

Mr. Hawkins: Second.

Chairman Darby: Moved and seconded that this motion be adopted, accepted as read. Secretary, please call the roll.

Secretary Bauer polled the Commission. The motion passed with a vote of 7-0.

Chairman Darby: So when can we anticipate getting our Bloomin' Onions?

Mr. Forte: Soon enough. I know their schedule is pretty tight. They don't always give us exact open dates. I'd have to check, but I would assume it's very, very soon, within a few months. They're doing renovations right now, so.

Chairman Darby: Thank you.

Mr. Forte: We appreciate the consideration.

Chairman Darby: Okay, thanks. Moving on.

B. 15 Acre site, located on Northwest Boulevard, Springdale, Ohio, Concept Plan Review. #30711.

Chairman Darby: Presenters please come forward. Do we need our easel again? Yes, we do. We can get that. Good evening.

Mr. Warnement: Good evening. I'm Patrick Warnement from the Kleingers Group of West Chester, Ohio, and I'm here with Jim White from Ridgeline Property Group, the developer for the site. You may recall we were here a few months ago with a different developer, and that deal didn't work out. This site is obviously very desirable for this type of industrial development, and Jim and his company were able to come to an agreement to hopefully move forward on this site for a new warehouse distribution type facility of roughly 250,000 square feet. The existing PUD for this site is for three office buildings, which is from some number of years ago. The way we're approaching it is a major PUD change, which I think the two Council members have to agree with, but that's the way we've been approaching it the whole time as a major PUD change, so. We submitted a packet and received some comments. The drawing that you see up here we sent by email today. We made some changes to what you what you have in your packet there to try to address some of the comments that we received. The main changes that you see there: the parking to the north, which is to the right side of your page, is not there anymore. There's an existing off-site drainage that come though that area, and an existing swale that we're trying to leave intact and not disturb, to allow that off-site drainage to continue to pass through this site. So we did that, shifted the building in that direction a little bit to increase the setback from Pictoria Drive, which we received a comment on, and will be able to add some parking to the south of the building near Pictoria Drive to be able to meet the parking code, so. Those were the changes that depart from what you see in the packet.

Chairman Darby: Okay.

(Inaudible off mic)

Mr. Warnement: Correct, and yes, there's a rendering that's been submitted which you should have, and we received a comment, I think the scaling on there might be wrong, the building's going to be approximately forty feet high. The scaling showed something different than that, and that's just incorrect, so there's just a scaling issue.

(Inaudible off mic)

Chairman Darby: Ms. McBride.

Ms. McBride: Is the applicant, are you done?

Mr. Warnement: Yes.

Ms. McBride: Okay. The Chair called me and I was like "Ohhhh."

Chairman Darby: I wouldn't cut them off!

Ms. McBride: No, I wouldn't think you would do that. The property is obviously within our PUD Planned Unit Development district, and the Comprehensive Plan from 2002 indicates this area for Regional Business Center, which is for large-scale office uses, with complementary service uses. February 9th of this year, the Commission heard a concept review for a similar plan for office and industrial use of the property. That was for a 235,330 square foot building. Since that time then, Ridgeline Property Group has approached the City with another concept plan. This concept plan contains 250,880 square feet of which 25,200 are office and then the balance is for warehouse. Two members, the two members of the Planning Commission that sit on Council would obviously, once a formal application should be made, would have to make the determination if this was a major or minor departure from the approved plan. Staff would suggest because it's a change of use that it would in fact be considered as a major modification. The code, the new zoning code requires a 100 foot setback from both Northwest Boulevard and Pictoria Drive, and my comments are on the plan that was submitted obviously previous to the one that we got this evening. The building was set back eighty feet from Northwest and seventy feet from Pictoria. It is in a PUD, so Planning Commission obviously could approve a modification to the setback requirements. The plan that we reviewed initially was showing forty parking spaces on the north side of the property, and they were backing out into what was one of the main truck access ways, and Staff has a real concern about the cross-conflict, so to speak between the trucks and the parking spaces. The applicant has indicated obviously that they have removed those forty spaces. There was a scaling issue on the building. It did actually scale ninety feet when I checked it, so it shrunk in height. It's now at forty feet. Seventy-five feet is what is permitted within that district. We will need to be receiving building elevations that demonstrate compliance with the new zoning code we now have, some design requirements for buildings in terms of how the building needs to be broken up and how that's to happen, so the applicant would need to be looking at those in future submittals. The PUD district would require thirty percent of the site to be open space. The applicant indicated that they have thirty-three percent, and we were asking for that area to be designated so we can see exactly where that is. Based on the plan that they submitted, they would be required to have 309 parking spaces. They can, as of right, take a ten percent reduction from that with the new zoning code, but the plan that we saw showed only 164 parking spaces, so that's again another modification that Planning Commission would need to consider. They will with future submittals need to be submitting a landscape plan and a lighting plan for the site, as well as details regarding building materials and how things like the mechanical equipment on the rooftop would be screened from view. Also, the covenants for the PUD may need to be amended based on what they're proposing. And then lastly, planning studies that have been completed for the City call for a cross-connection between the Avon site to the east through to this site, so that's something that the Planning Commission may also want to consider. If you have questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

Chairman Darby: Before we move on, could we get our input from our Councilpersons?

Ms. McBride: I think, Mr. Chair, that we don't, won't need to do that until they make a formal submittal.

Chairman Darby: Okay, at that time. Thank you. Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. A couple of things in addition to what Ms. McBride mentioned. There are some trees on the site which there's gonna need to be consideration of the tree preservation ordinance at a later time, and I think Planning Commission may want to hear how the truck access is actually going to work in terms of getting the in and out of the site and also within the site. There's some concern about the access point on Pictoria Drive, which you may wish to look into. I think everything else that I had on my list of discussion items Ms. McBride already mentioned, so. Nothing further.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Mr. Shvegza.

Mr. Shvezgda: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On the site layout as far as the drive access, we do have a driveway that was on the Northwest Boulevard that serves as an access point for the truck dock. There's also one more midway to the site that's for the parking lot. We do have another driveway that's on Pictoria Island that's been discussed that appears to serve the truck dock. It's now separated from the existing emergency access point that in one of the presentations beforehand, they'd been combined. There's still the concern of truck traffic entering onto Pictoria Island because of the heavy vehicular automotive traffic through the office building garages at that point. We had mentioned the cross-connection, as far as that being something that's being under consideration for many years. The storm water management, so they are showing underground detention in the vicinity of the driveway to Pictoria Drive, and the, I assume that's a dry detention basin up to Northwest Boulevard. There's based on the previous design for the storm sewer system in the area, there's specific locations for a certain amount of flow that needs to be directed to those locations, so that has to be taken care of in the final design for the detention system there. AS far as traffic, traffic study would need to be performed because have a major change in use here since we sat down with the traffic engineer at the previous submittal, and they dictated the specific criteria they used in the study, so. That concludes my comments.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Could we get some clarification? The previous submittal, what was the total square footage of that footprint?

Ms. McBride: The request that we heard in February was 235,330 square feet.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Could we start it out with the discussion of, when we had the previous discussion, there were some, there was an issue raised by this Body regarding the size of the building, and that particular site. What was your reasoning with coming to us with a new proposal that's even larger than that one?

(Inaudible off mic)

Chairman Darby: Could you come to the mic please? Could you move to the mic? Thank you.

Mr. White: So as a medium-sized office warehouse distribution building, we're concerned about utilization on the site. You know, that product that we've laid out is state-of-the-art, class A, not a lot of it on the market. It's got adequate parking now with the reconfiguration of the site plan that Patrick did today, and it's, given the metrics of what's required in the City of Springdale, it accommodates the 250. And to the extent that we can enlarge the building beyond what it was before by some other developer.

Chairman Darby: Okay. I would like for someone from Staff to comment about the City's mindset as far as what as applicable for that site.

Ms. McBride: Well, I think that the City has standards relative to setbacks and parking requirements and open space requirements, and I think that if all of those can be met with the 250,880 building, then that's good. If they can't all be met, and the Commission chooses to modify those requirements, then that's okay, but that's a decision that the Commission needs to make.

Chairman Darby: Okay.

Mr. White: Just one more comment there.

Chairman Darby: Sure.

Mr. White: With the advent of the changes we made today, it's a work in progress.

Chairman Darby: I know, this is concept. We're aware of that.

Mr. White: Yeah, so when we formally submit, we will meet the metrics, the details of what's required by the City.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Mr. Okum.

Mr. Okum: Yes, thank you Mr. Chairman. I'm, I tend to agree with the reasoning of this type because it does appear to be Type A office warehouse. There are some concerns when you were originally with 140 parking spaces and our zoning code calls for 306. Where are you at now this?

Mr. White: 270.

Mr. Okum: You're at, oh so you bumped it up a bunch. So you're at, okay. And that makes a big difference

(Inaudible off mic)

Mr. Okum: To shield and screen the area. So you're basically getting closer to the requirement and you're indicated, sir, that you'd be able probably to hit it. The reason I say that is, I certainly want to stay at the 30-33% requirement, and when we were 150-60 parking spaces, I was little concerned that you'd be able to keep that 33% when you start put in more parking.

Mr. White: I understand.

Mr. Okum: Putting in more asphalt. The cross-connection between this site and the Avon site, that was discussed at previous submission. You are familiar with it. You probably are familiar with it. Okay so you're familiar with that...

Mr. White: I'm aware of the idea of it, yeah.

Mr. Okum: Okay, how's your feelings about that?

Mr. White: I don't like it.

Mr. Okum: You don't like it, because they'd be using your driveway.

Mr. White: Well, it's almost connected to my driveway. And if you look, if you look at the cut from the emergency access point, it's no more than...

Mr. Okum: Can you illustrate on the drawings? That would help the rest of the Commission.

Mr. Warnement: Sure. There's the entrance drive, which would be to the truck port basically, and here is the existing emergency access, which I mean if you drive by there on any given day, there's usually cars parked there. So, I don't think it's used a whole lot to be honest with you.

Mr. White: Let me just tell you a little bit about the (inaudible).

Mr. Okum: Okay.

Mr. White: This drive is the main entrance.

Mr. Okum: Sure.

Mr. White: It's a good thing to have dual...

Mr. Okum: Can we, is, are you getting all that?

Recording Secretary Moore: I can hear it relatively well, but I don't know how well it's going to pick up on the recording. He's talking pretty clearly; I should be okay.

Mr. Okum: Okay, thank you.

Recording Secretary Moore: Thank you for asking.

Mr. White: State-of-the-art, what the users want, you know the P&G, the Krafts, corporate America. They want dual access into a truck port. They want isolated access into the auto parking, so this cut and that cut provides that capability. Ideally, you want the flow of tractor trailers to be counterclockwise around the building, so when they come in here, they're making this turn, coming in to the east and back up to the west then back up to this wall. They want to look over their right shoulder, not their left because it's blind, so the ideal flow would be back here, come down here, making this, but the building is set up to be multi-tenant, as well as a single-tenant user. If we were fortunate enough to get a tenant, we look for high credit rated companies as tenants, so as an example, if P&G wanted half this building and they wanted to be on this end of the building, they may want this truck port secure, which is another reason why we need two access points into the truck port, so we can serve this half over here or this half over here. Now, so when you look at the southern cut here, you've got this emergency drive that's not matter than 30 feet from the center point of this driveway, this ingress into the truck port. So, at 7:30 in the morning or 4:30 in the afternoon when you've got 100-150 automobiles wanting to vacate right here, out of this parking lot, I've got tractor trailers trying to get into the truck port. It's a mess. It's a quagmire.

Mr. Okum: Could you, is there availability to get in off that, that would be north, on the north side?

Mr. White: Over here?

Mr. Okum: Yeah. If you put your cross-access point in there, would that give you the, eliminate that issue of that conflict?

Mr. Warnement: That would basically turn that into a public road going through the north part of our site.

Mr. Okum: Okay.

Mr. Warnement: Or there'd have to be an access easement or something like that.

Mr. White: (inaudible) this is not an access road too.

Mr. Okum: So park...

Mr. White: It's made into a parking lot.

Mr. Okum: Currently yes.

Mr. White: Which is private property, so is this were a situation where that (inaudible) we came in and tried to get a second approval this building would cut 40 feet to the west. We'd never get it. There's not a county, city, township on the face of the globe that would want to approve that. What I don't understand is what's driving it. The need.

Mr. Okum: Staff?

Mr. Warnement: I mean Avon had thousands of employees in the past, and even if Macy's hits 1,000 employees it's going to be a fraction of what that site used to have coming in and out.

Chairman Darby: Staff want to clarify that?

Mr. Shvezgda: Well ultimately was the ability to have the traffic from the Avon building to be able to access Crescentville Road. The signal is an alternate means of getting to I-275. That was the bottom line.

Mr. Okum: So if there's already access, cross-access, or not, there's currently access from the Avon property to Pictoria...

Mr. Warnement: There's a gate there.

Mr. Okum:... then, what would, I guess the applicants' question is, is what would be the benefit of them providing an additional cross-access. And I'm one for, I promote cross-access in, on county-representation at the Regional Planning Commission, and most of the townships require it as a requirement of development, and you're familiar with that as well.

Mr. Warnement: Yes.

Mr. Okum: So you know that that's a standard requirement, but if there's already a connection, then okay, Mr. Shvezgda, help us out here so I understand.

Mr. Shvezgda: That particular driveway is designated as emergency access and is gated.

Mr. Okum: Could that eventually be changed out without a major... I mean he doesn't like it at all, but I'm thinking of the big picture is Avon had 1,000 people and multiple points.

Mr. Shvezgda: Question on the change. I mean are you talking about changing the designation of what that easement's for?

Mr. Okum: Right.

Mr. Shvezgda: That'd be something we'd have to work the property owner.

Mr. Okum: Is that on your property, sir, or is that?

Mr. Warnement: Yes.

Mr. Okum: That is on your property. Okay. How much of that, that whole corner there is cross-access easement area. Okay. You're bound by that cross-access which is part of the, it's attached to that deed.

Mr. White: The access point is (inaudible).

Mr. Okum: Okay. Is that how it's written in the code, or in the...

Mr. Shvezgda: That's how the easement is defined.

Mr. Okum: That's how the easement is. It's an emergency access easement. Okay. It is what it is. That answers my question. Thank you.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Bauer.

Mr. Bauer: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a couple thoughts, comments. Couple things that in my mind are priority. The traffic study generated from this to have a good explanation of what kind of outcome that is and what that does for, for getting in and out of the site. Storm water management, to have that well thought out and brought the two subjects that Mr. Okum talked about. Having, you know if we're varying from the zoning codes to have an explanation for what, because we're, because this is a PUD, we have some latitude to have good explanation of why, why we're deviating if we have to deviate, but to have a good explanation for that in regards to parking. And we've already had a long discussion about cross-connections, so I guess those were the biggest items in my mind.

Mr. White: So where we're at in the process now just so everyone's aware, we've got issues in the land. We've got a wetlands issue on the land. We've been wrestling with the Corps of Engineers and the Ohio State EPA, and we're deep into it. If we have to spend tens of thousands of dollars, a hundred thousand, whatever our due diligence until we get a clear picture of what the timing of that is and whether or not it can be permitted, so we haven't vetted out engineering-wise, Mr. Bauer, all those things that you just recited. I

can't wait to do it, because when we do it, we know we've got permissible mitigation of land that we can build on and it's a situation that's really self-created with 25,000 cubic yards of top-soil dumped on top of it, so there's three areas that are isolated in the minds of the common Corps of the Federal Government. In fact that person was out there last Thursday to opine to that, and she didn't claim any jurisdiction of waters, but the fine State of Ohio EPA has the right to come in and override whatever the Corps says. They are going to claim it as jurisdiction, but isolated, which means best case, it has to go on public notice that it exists and it's a waiting period. We have to have it disclosed circularly around the public for 30 days to see if there's comment, concern, rebuttal, whatever, from the public and it just goes on and on. I don't think there will be. I think it will be said and done. There's no residential around it, but then you have to wait for Ohio EPA to issue a permit, and that's another issue. So I've got to try and beat the clock here to get it on the ground before winter. So we've got 60 days plus or minus just raw due diligence, environmental and traffic studies, storm water management issues, engineering and the site plan, the site itself, utilities, the storm water management, we're deep into the jurisdictional water issue. We had to deal with the tree issue on site, I don't know if you're aware of that and then there's other utility verification (inaudible). We have held off doing all that work pending what the Ohio State EPA is going to do. The fellow that was supposed to be there last Thursday did not show up. He was sick in the hospital and we're talking to the Director of the EPA Friday, and he's going get it reassigned and get somebody out here. Physically has to look at it and that'll again start the clock. We're anxious. It's a great site for this kind of product. We can't replace it.

Mr. Warnement: Basically, Mr. Bauer, the contours that you see with the dry detention pond and the underground detention area was just a preliminary volume calculation to say "alright, how much of this is going to need to be underground?" type of thing and so that's what you see there. Just a real raw early-on calculation of can we provide this volume for water quality and detention. And as Mr. Shvezda said, we did meet with the City regarding traffic and defining the scope and that type of thing. We just haven't actually done the study yet, so we understand what we need to do once the EPA issue gets solved.

Chairman Darby: Mrs. Harlow.

Mrs. Harlow: Yes, I'm sorry but I need to go back to that cross-connection please. That was inherited with the land?

Mr. Warnement: Correct.

Mr. White: The easement on our land.

Mrs. Harlow: Okay and if it's an easement, it always stays with the property? There's never a chance of getting it off there? I mean like God would have to come down and remove it, or ...?

Mr. Warnement: Yes, we can get rid of easements, absolutely. But right now it's an emergency access easement.

Mrs. Harlow: Right.

Mr. White: Which the City required.

Mrs. Harlow: Which we required. Is it still necessary that we, the City require that?

Mr. Okum. I think when we have an opportunity to have an access for emergency vehicles or purposes, we should retain that access.

Mrs. Harlow: Is that easement, cause I know you mentioned the delivery trucks or the big semis coming through there.

Mr. Okum: The chances of that emergency access, if I may.

Mr. Darby: Sure, Mr. Okum.

Mr. Okum: The chances of that emergency access ever being utilized would be for fire emergency personnel in case there would be a catastrophic occurrence.

Mr. White: I'm fine with that.

Mr. Okum: He's fine with that. He just doesn't want it to be a driveway.

Mr. White: For clerical folks or, it's a call center, right? It's going to feed that building. There's going to be a lot of...

Mrs. Harlow: My question is, is that where the cross-connection is located, is that hampering your ability to get tractor trailers into there?

Mr. Warnement: Not as long as it stays emergency access, no.

Mr. White: Not as long as it stays gated and fire marshals can access it.

Mr. Warnement: We've done a truck turn analysis, and the turn, the trucks are able to make that left into our site without any issue,

Mrs. Harlow: Okay and then you mentioned, because I, one of the things I had on my notes was that you had 164 spaces. You mentioned now that you're up to 270.

Mr. Warnement: 270.

Mrs. Harlow: And...

Mr. Warnement: Unfortunately we were just able to email that today, so I'm sure not very many folks here have seen it yet.

Mrs. Harlow: So at 270 parking spaces, would the warehouse possible be, or the offices possible be shift work, so that those would rotate out, or do you feel like that, I mean do you feel like that's adequate for whoever might occupy the building?

Mr. Warnement: For overlapping between shifts, basically? It's speculative what, we can't say for 100 percent sure today to be totally honest.

Mrs. Harlow: Just was curious.

Mr. White: When you look at the profile of tenancies in this market, I lived here for eleven years. I ran Prologis for that period of time, 94-05, 06, whatever. Yes, it's more than adequate. Now if there's an e-commerce user that comes along with heavy automation, with a mezzanine inside the building, I've built several Amazon buildings, million square footers, that would be a small e-commerce use. It would be a single user, and they're heavy-heavy parked opportunities, particularly if it's seasonal like Amazon, from September till the end of the year. It's a non-sort; it's less than automation, and 1000 car park for a million square foot. For the full-blown sort, it's 2,500, so 270, that could be a little bit light, actually, but it's probably adequate.

Mrs. Harlow: Okay.

Chairman Darby: Did Staff have any other comments they wanted to make before we move on? Any other bits of input for these folks, for their consideration on this concept discussion? Mr. Okum.

Mr. Okum: I'm very encouraged by the project. I think if it, basically it's similar to what was before but I think it's going to be a little bit classier level. I think it'll be a positive development for the City, then I did also want to compliment Mr. Taylor. This checklist is a very useful tool and I appreciate your putting that together like that. It's easier for the

applicant to see it, and as far as us looking at the project, it sort of helps regenerate thought. So thank you for doing that.

Chairman Darby: Mmmhmm. Any other questions of us?

Mr. Warnement: Not right now. Once we have EPA information, we'll certainly share that with Don and Gregg, or Mr. Taylor, and you know make sure that everybody's comfortable with the fact that...

Chairman Darby: I just want to say I'm somewhat offended because you're at a stage now where we're supposed to be the ones who bug you, not EPA. They're getting in our lane here. Okay. Thank you for coming in.

Mr. Warnement: There will be plenty of opportunity in the future.

Chairman Darby: Alright, thank you very much. Okay.

Mr. Okum: Thank you.

Chairman Darby: Moving on. Our next presentation. Everyone okay?

- C. The former Princeton Bowl, 11711 Princeton Pike Unit 910, Springdale, Ohio, Concept Plan Review. #30722.

Chairman Darby: No one showed. Going once, going twice... Well, do we have any word from the applicants?

Mr. Taylor: As I understand it, Mr. Schneider had a death in his family, and I believe he was out of town last week. We attempted to, well when we sent the Staff comments Friday, we inquired as to whether he would be attending the meeting and we never heard back from him, so my surmise is there must have been some complication and he wasn't able to attend. We didn't get any official word one way or the other.

Chairman Darby: Is this Commission's preference to table?

Mr. Okum: Move to table.

Mrs. Harlow: I have a question.

Chairman Darby: Yes.

Mrs. Harlow: Are we allowed to discuss this at all without them being here?

Chairman Darby: I don't think that would be appropriate.

Mrs. Harlow: Well I don't mean, more general. But okay.

Chairman Darby: Because it's not...

Mrs. Harlow: That person would not be here to respond to whatever or general comments might have been. We do have a motion to table. Is there a second?

Mr. Hawkins: Second.

Chairman Darby: Moved and seconded that this item be tabled until our next meeting. Voice vote, all those in favor?

The motion was approved 7-0.

Chairman Darby: That is tabled.

Mr. Taylor: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

VIII. DISCUSSION

Chairman Darby: Do we have any items to be brought forth for discussion? Yes we do.
Mr. Shveg zda.

Mr. Shveg zda: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Darby: Storm water retention.

Mr. Shveg zda: Yes, at the last meeting, I think Mr. Okum had a question regarding that there was basically a cutoff metric for detention requirement, so I thought I would go ahead and bring forth what we have as requirements as far as the storm water management, and basically just to summarize it, basically if it's less than an acre of redeveloped land, or developed new land, retention is not required. Regarding redevelopment, it notes that where all existing site is being partially or totally redeveloped, all requirements of this chapter will be in full force and effect. If conditions warrant a partially redeveloped site, and the developer can show that application of all requirements would cause a hardship, he may request partial relief from Planning Commission. We've had some instances in the past where we've looked at okay, what would the detention be for a footprint of a new building within an existing developed area. Sometimes that's been something that Planning Commission has gone forward with and on other occasions, it's been something Planning Commission has said it was little value for the particular site, so that's got to be weighed depending on the situation. The only other thing that I brought up and here to is of course we have the water quality requirements in the storm water regulations, and that has a specific requirement for redevelopment situations to where basically you're kind of applying twenty percent of what would normally be required either through a combination reducing the impervious area providing that the storm water quality measures the twenty percent or some combination of both. So those are kind of the parameters of what the storm water management regulations have.

Mr. Okum: So Mr. Shveg zda, if a development wishes to put a new façade on a business, do we consider that redevelopment?

Mr. Shveg zda: Not from the standpoint of storm water, because you're not effectively disturbing the surface

Mr. Okum: Based upon that, (inaudible).

Mr. Shveg zda: At this point, I thought we could kind of take a look at it, discuss it, consider if anything comes up that we've noted in the past or in the future that needs some kind of tweaking to define different aspects of when it is or is not required. We can certainly do that.

Mr. Okum: But we, we've been able to use good planning practices to address those small redevelopment sites.

Mr. Shveg zda: Yeah, I think it, now we're in the mode of looking at the possibility of instead of actually detention volume requirements, we look at the storm water quality aspect and that has more flexibility in its implementation in some of these redevelopment sites.

Mr. Okum: Because you've got absorption rate and...

Mr. Shveg zda: And just to kind of go back, we had the discussion on the Meadows at Maple Knoll, and they've actually submitted plans that detail with a certain square footage of pervious pavement in the vicinity, where that new parking lot was proposed. So that's kind of a basically a clean water kinds of aspect, where you're reducing the impervious area of the site.

Chairman Darby: Any comments?

IX. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT - None.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Darby: I'm waiting.

Mrs. Harlow: Make a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Hawkins: Second.

Chairman Darby: Do you notice, the seconds are always delayed until we get to this very last item?

Mr. Okum: Always fast on the second.

Chairman Darby: Silent vote. We are adjourned.

The City of Springdale Planning Commission meeting concluded at approximately 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

_____, 2016 _____
Don Darby, Chairman

_____, 2016 _____
Richard Bauer, Secretary