

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
SEPTEMBER 8, 2015
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, Marge Boice, Don Darby, Robert Diehl,
Carolyn Ghantous, Marjorie Harlow

Member Absent: Dave Okum

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

III. MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF AUGUST 11th, 2015

Chairman Darby: At this time the Chair will accept a motion to adopt the Minutes of our previous meeting of August 11th, 2015.

Mrs. Ghantous: Move to adopt. (Mrs. Harlow seconded the motion. With five "aye" votes, the August 11th, 2015 Minutes were adopted as submitted. There was one abstention, Mrs. Boice, who was not at that Planning Commission meeting.)

IV. REPORT ON COUNCIL

Mrs. Harlow provided a summary report of the August 19th and September 2nd, 2015 City of Springdale City Council meetings.

V. CORRESPONDENCE

Chairman Darby: There are no items of correspondence that I am aware of at this time.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

Chairman Darby: There are no items of Old Business.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Jake Sweeney Request for Modification to the BMW Development Plan

Mr. Michael Leach: I am the Construction Manager for the Sweeney Organization. I am here representing the dealership to ask for an addition on the back of the existing BMW store. We have already gone through the process to get a variance through the Zoning Board for the offset in the back. I believe Mrs. McBride had some questions regarding that and I am here to answer those.

Mrs. McBride provided the City Planner report.

Mr. Taylor provided City Staff comments.

Mr. Shvegza provided City Engineer comments.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Leach, I noticed you were nodding in agreement with some of the comments that were made. Would you like to comment?

Mr. Leach: Yes, if I may. We did go back to the architect and I am trying to solve several problems here. We have gotten with the owner and we are re-platting part of both parcels. We are eliminating the south property line that Mrs. McBride mentioned. That solves two problems - it solves the problem with the parking area and it solves the problem with the variance for the offset. So that is actually in the

works right now and it is supposed to be done within the next couple of weeks. I do have drawings here, if I can pass these out, it might make it easier to understand.

Chairman Darby: Sure.

(Mr. Leach provided drawings to Staff and Planning Commission Members.)

Mr. Leach: The drawing on the top is actually an older drawing made by Abercrombie but it shows the original property lines on there so you can see. It is self-explanatory on the drawing what is being eliminated and what's being extended to the south. As far as the dumpster, they also include in that package a revised plot plan that shows the location of the dumpster that you mentioned; we can position it that way to keep out of the easement of that sanitary sewer. It actually shows the elevations in this package as well as the building itself. The colors are all going to be white to match the existing BMW store. As far as the landscaping goes, there will be additional landscaping in front of the building, additional green space in the front of the building that we are changing from pavers to green space.

Chairman Darby: Since we are just in receipt of this document, it is understood that anything upon which we agree this evening will be contingent upon Staff's acceptance after they get a chance to really look this over.

Mr. Leach: I understand. And as well, I understand that this also would be contingent upon the final re-platting and I can get that to you just as soon as it is made.

Chairman Darby: Any other comments from Staff at this time? (No comments presented from Staff.) Any questions?

Mr. Bauer: Because I have the responsibility to put together the motion, I have just a couple of questions. To go back to Staff's comments - so what I understood you to say is you are going to go to the Board of Zoning Appeals for the 6'?

Chairman Darby: That will be taken care of with what is submitted.

Mr. Bauer: Parking spaces?

Mrs. McBride: That is taken care of.

Mr. Bauer: The dumpster is taken care of, okay.

Mrs. Harlow: I was just going to state that on Mrs. McBride's comments, from what I was hearing, we could cross off Sections #4 and #5.

Mrs. McBride: Yes, if you turn to the last page #3 of my staff report of considerations, we could take off #1, #2 and #6 can all come off. Staff can review the documentation that the Applicant gave us this evening for compliance for the dumpster enclosure and so forth. Number 5 and #7 need to stay, to just make sure during construction if landscaping is damaged and that tires and etc. are not stored outdoors; those two need to stay.

Mrs. Harlow: And #3, the details of the relocation?

Mrs. McBride: Right, I would just leave that in there because although they had given them to me in a preliminary look-over, they look fine but we just want to look at that and send them something in writing that says they are fine.

Mrs. Harlow: And you're okay with the exterior materials?

Mrs. McBride: Yes, because it is a continuation of the existing materials; which we thought but we just need the confirmation of that.

Mr. Leach: And if I may, on that last page of package that I just handed out, there is actually the layout of the dumpster enclosure.

Mrs. Harlow: With the elevations, yes.

Mr. Diehl: Will this have any impact on where you will unload new cars?

Mr. Leach: No, sir, that is all in the south; that will be done on that south parking area that is all designed for that.

Mr. Diehl: That won't change from the last time you were here?

Mr. Leach: No, sir.

Mr. Diehl: Okay. Have you addressed the fire lane?

Mr. Leach: Yes, sir. As the gentleman discussed, we can give a cross-easement for that property because the Sweeney's own both of them. I think it is actually shown on the plot plan where that goes. In actuality, a fire truck couldn't get back there in the back anyway, as it is now. It would still have to go up on the upper ramp to be able to fight a fire as you can see, I believe, in those photographs.

Mr. Diehl: And that was acceptable with Mr. Lindsey when you were there.

Mr. Taylor: Yes.

Chairman Darby: I believe we're ready.

Mr. Bauer: I would like to make a motion to approve the Jake Sweeney BMW Modification Plan to the Development at 11535 Jake Sweeney Place to include approval based on all Staff comments, eliminating #1, #2 and #6 from Mrs. McBride's comments and including the rest of the City Engineer's and Building Department comments and conditional on Staff review and acceptance of submitted material that we received tonight.

(Mrs. Ghantous seconded the motion. With six "aye" votes from the Planning Commission Members, the motion with conditions was approved.)

B. Tri-County Mall Modification of the PUD

Mr. John Schupp: I am with Avison Young, representing Tri-County Mall as the developer of the project.

Ms. Corinne Cassidy: I am with A359 Partners in Architecture.

Mr. Schupp: With respect to the proposal, we had a larger PUD Modification up until the end of last week. Due to the lack of progress of a couple leases in place, we have pared down to what you have right now. I reported that to Mr. Taylor last week, Thursday, I believe, as to paring down the proposal. Although you see the name on the proposal of the restaurant for Outparcel #2, note that we had a pause in our lease negotiations because their original plans called for a different footprint of the building and a different elevation of the building based upon their own branding and where they are going now with their prototype in the development. We had to pause the leasing and we knew we needed to come here anywhere for the Minor PUD Modifications, so that is why we are here to present to you their change of the footprint design and their building elevation design. Corinne will pass out the details to you, most of which are contained in your booklet already. With respect to the square footage and impact on the site, it remains virtually the same. The building is approximately 36 s.f. larger, although the interior space is larger because their research has shown that people don't use the patio space as much as they should so there is a signature patio but it is a lot smaller in size. There is a larger interior square footage as opposed to the combination that they had beforehand, which was a larger exterior patio. The parking doesn't change and the footprint doesn't change at all, that all remains the same based upon the original site. What did change on the site

plan because of the footprint change was the landscaping change and those drawing details were submitted as well. With respect to the elevations, the colors haven't changed at all. The colors are the same, the forms have changed; they had a number of angled forms and format. Their research and their own modification of their own brand prototype has changed, so this building is a little bit more linear than what was previously submitted. The materials are almost identical, in terms of the stone and the wood and the EIFS material, as well as the glass, glass-metal system. Like I said, the colors haven't changed at all, that is what we are here for to seek the approval of this new design for the prototype such that if we are successful then we can go back and finish up the lease.

Mrs. McBride: By our Code, the two Members of Planning Commission who serve on Council are going to need to make the decision that this is, in fact, a Minor Change to the PUD. So if we could do that and cross that item off of our list.

Mrs. Harlow: I believe it is a Minor Change to the PUD, given that we have already made a previous change.

Mr. Diehl: I agree.

Mrs. McBride: Excellent, thank you.

Mrs. McBride provided the City Planner report.

Mr. Taylor: I have nothing to add, thank you.

Mr. Shvezda: Since there is no real change to this site, the parking, the access, or the storm water, I have no comments.

Chairman Darby: Continue to carry the load, Mrs. McBride. Do we have questions? Have you anticipated your schedule for construction?

Mr. Schupp: Yes, we would intend to prepare the pad before the end of the year, turn the pad over to the tenants, so that we can successfully reach a lease negotiation, which we are well underway with. The tenant would start their work the first quarter of next year and open at the end of the first quarter of next year.

Mrs. Boice: I just wanted to tell you that I am really impressed with your color scheme - I like it. I did have a question - how soon will you be submitting the sign proposals?

Mr. Schupp: Based upon tonight's hearing, like we said, we will continue with the lease. The tenant wanted to pause the lease negotiations until they were certain to get the PUD approval.

Mrs. Boice: I understand.

Mr. Schupp: As soon as the lease is done, then they will wrap up their tenant plans and design and more than likely you will get a design proposal probably within, I would say, ninety to one hundred and twenty days.

Mrs. Boice: I just think we are all very eager for this move of Outback and, as I said, I really think your color scheme is quite stunning. Thank you.

Mr. Schupp: We are eager as well.

Mrs. Harlow: I just wanted to comment the same thing that Mrs. Boice said - your colors and the design of the building are very attractive.

Mr. Bauer: I would like to make a motion concerning the Tri-County Mall Outback project and the motion is to approve the afore-mentioned project which includes the information that we have received tonight and in the previous submittal and includes

all Staff comments, to also include Staff review and approval of a Landscape Plan. This approval includes no signage at this time.

(Mrs. Ghantous seconded the motion. With six "aye" votes from the Planning Commission Members, the motion was approved.)

Chairman Darby: Thank you for coming.

C. Tri-County Commerce Park, Major Modification to the PUD Plan

Chairman Darby: I think that I need to announce how we will operate here procedurally, because, as I recall, we have dealt with this topic before and we had established the protocol at that time. We will provide for those in attendance, who choose to do so, to make comments. We will do that after our reports have been presented. I might add that if you do plan to make comments, we do ask that you sign in for the Minutes.

Mr. Steve Dragon: Good evening, my name is Steve Dragon with Vandercar Holdings, the prospective developer for the project that is before you this evening for Tri-County Commerce Park. As you all know, in April of this year we submitted a preliminary PUD Plan for a Major Amendment to the PUD to permit development of the GEEAA Golf Course and former employee park as a business park known as Tri-County Commerce Park. Following public hearings in May, June, and July at the Planning Commission, the Commission voted not to recommend approval of that plan and in last month's City Council meeting, Council voted not to approve the Major Amendment as submitted previously. Based on the discussions from the July Planning Commission meeting, and after seeking concurrence of our understanding of those discussions from City Staff, we identified some of the primary objections to the previous plan which is shown here. Primary among those was #1, the presence of our outdoor storage yard on the south side of proposed Building #1. Secondly, the overall size and massing and height of proposed Buildings #1 and #2 - Building #1, being proposed at a maximum of about 422,000 s.f. and Building #2 at 442,000 s.f. and a maximum height of 48'. And third, the building setback along the eastern boundary of the property, which abuts the existing single-family residential subdivision known as Heritage Hills. In recognition of the objections, we have submitted a modified Preliminary Development Plan that is before you tonight and we hope it addresses those concerns. The plan includes the following revisions - first, we have eliminated the outdoor storage yard that was present in the previous proposal that was intended for Ferguson Industries. We have also modified the covenants and conditions and restrictions that we submitted to eliminate outdoor storage absent specific Planning Commission approval. One thing that I do need to point out that was submitted in error with our plan - we have noted that we would not have loading facing frontage streets; we are asking tonight for one exception from that, which is on the north side of Building #1. It is necessary for the project to be successful for us to have the ability to make this a cross-dock facility. As the plan indicates, we are showing docking on the north and the south side of this new proposed Building #1. The previous plan did not have docking on this side but does now to accommodate not providing that outdoor storage area on south side of the building so we are asking for that approval this evening. We also have reduced the sizes of both Buildings #1 and #2 to 374,400 s.f. each. This plan shows the difference in size between the prior buildings and the buildings as proposed. This reduction in square footage represents approximately a 15% reduction in the overall building size for these two buildings. As well, we are asking for a maximum building height of 44', as opposed to the previous 48' in the prior plan approval; so that is a reduction of about 10% in the overall building size for these buildings, as well. Probably more dramatically, this plan increases the building setback along the eastern property line from 125', based on the prior proposal, to double that to 250' on the current proposal. This layout puts Buildings #1 and #2 approximately equal distance from the nearest residential structure in Heritage Hills, as well as to the nearest residential structure in the Crossings at the Park Condominium project at about 315' each; that is the approximate building separation from any of the existing residential buildings on either side of the project. In conclusion, the modified plan that we present for your approval this evening offers

Springdale, we believe, the best opportunity for responsible redevelopment of this property and provides an economically viable plan. It significantly improves the property value of the property, provides an engine for job creation, encourages major private investment in the City and we believe it is a plan that accommodates the concerns of the adjacent neighboring uses and we are excited to bring this project to fruition. We would ask for your recommendation of approval this evening so that we can move on to City Council with this plan. We will be happy to answer any questions.

Chairman Darby: We will move to the Staff reports.

Mrs. McBride: Not to be repetitive, however, I will need the two Members of Planning Commission who serve on Council, since this is a new consideration, to make the determination that in fact this is a Major Modification from the approved PUD and that it will need to go on to Council.

Mrs. Harlow: In my opinion, it is a Major Modification.

Mr. Diehl: I agree with that.

Mrs. McBride: The second item that I would ask the Commission to take note of is the designation from the Comprehensive Plan. I am not going to go into that because we have talked about that at a number of other meetings. You know that it was a focus area and there were a number of guidelines. I have continued to include those in my Staff reports; I hope you have had a chance to take a look at that.

Mrs. McBride provided the City Planner's report.

Mrs. McBride: I did receive correspondence and I know several Members of the Planning Commission also did. Because it wasn't contained in all of the packets, I feel that we need to read this into the record. If the Chair is acceptable of that, then I will do that.

Chairman Darby: I am.

Mrs. McBride: This email is from Sam Sheffield, 222 Edinburgh Lane:

"Dear Marge Boice, Marjorie Harlow, Mrs. McBride, and Thomas Vanover, I am writing about the GEEAA Park. You can see that I live in Crossings at the Park, my first concern is the 747 and Crescentville intersection. Right now, when I come out onto 747 at any time of day, there can be up to ten to twelve tractor trailers lined up, which is 60' to 75'. On Crescentville, it can be six to eight tractor trailers plus cars all trying to get to and from 275. You need to remember Duff Drive at International, where trucks come from. With the new project, would you not know what the businesses are? I work at a chemical company with four warehouses, 30' high in one tower, there are eighty employees and my company has twenty to thirty trucks in and out per day. A trucking company, engine plant, - Vandercar Holdings said the City will have one thousand more cars per day due to employment. Then you have Thornton moving to that corner to take advantage of the trucking business. Bottom line, there is no way to handle this kind of volume of traffic. Do you want a traffic nightmare? This is very scary from a transportation vantage point. Do you want a Sharonville problem like Mosteller and Crescentville? It is my understanding, if this construction goes through, there will be City streets. In order to help the neighborhood maintain its value, they should have sidewalks and leave mature trees in place, a small park area for residence and their pets would be a welcome addition. Trees in this construction site are mature trees and should be kept in buffer areas for the sake of the residences. Other smaller PUD require protection of all trees. This site has a comprehensive plan in place to protect Heritage Hill and now Crossings at the Park because of a City vote in 2004. If you want to see how mature trees are protected, drive through Glendale or Wyoming. Replacing trees with warehouses is not in the name of progress. Some of these trees are over fifty years old. Dropping the height by only 4' of warehousing is doing the very minimum. The two neighborhoods around GEEAA are Heritage Hill with twelve homes on the market and Crossings at the Park with five of the older units for sale, not counting LLC bankruptcy units. You have

Heritage Hill with homes built in the late 1950, condos were built in 2004 because of the City blessing on the Glen Sheppard Development. It looks like these neighborhoods are now in the process of deterioration. What homes or condos will still have any residents in five years? Residences of Crossing at the Park have lost in value around \$60,000 for anyone living there over five years. The City approved Glen Sheppard's Development, the City owes residents a plan to improve value not destroy it. I see that the Vandercar plan has been worked on for over six months and now we are just going through the motions; see enclosure. In conclusion, please remember the 2002 adopted Comprehensive Plan, which is to protect residences, stresses the need to protect the residential neighborhood. Are you doing that? Are you preserving trees? Are you keeping a park-like setting or are you going to look the other way?"

It is signed Sam Sheffield III. Attached to it was an article from the Cincinnati Business Courier on the redevelopment of the park property.

Mr. Taylor: Since you all have seen this before, my comments address essentially the changes from the previous plan and I think Mrs. McBride highlighted all those. I would bring just a couple of things to your attention, including the cover letter that I believe you all received.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Taylor, since the audience doesn't have our reports, could you please be a little bit more detailed in your report?

Mr. Taylor provided City Staff comments.

Mr. Shvezda provided the City Engineer report.

Chairman Darby: At this time, we are going to allow attendees who choose to do so to make brief remarks; please come forward. I think it might be somewhat awkward to have you sign in, so please make sure we get your name.

Mr. Leo Noahr: Leo Noahr, 407 Lisbon Lane. I recall the old saying, "Nature abhors a vacuum". I am concerned about the potential uses of the vacant golf course; something is going to go in there. We have been told that the mowing of the property would be just periphery and for the interior, they could not force people to mow it. So that means only a couple hundred feet along 747 and Crescentville would be mowed. One of the workmen told me the other day that there are about seventy dead trees there and they are going to go down. Would wildlife, drug dealers, homeless or other vagrants want the use of the vacated land? There is a park in Hamilton and since August 8th, they talk about that park. An individual has to go out there and clean up the beer cans and needles from the drug dealers, etc. four hours a week and he does it on his own. Section 8 might go in there and I know the City doesn't want it but that might be what happens. The approval of the Applicant's project would present manicured areas and well-maintained public roads. The project would relieve Crossings at the Park of the responsibility of maintaining a deteriorating road that may have to be rebuilt in five or six years; it is in very bad shape. We would also be relieved of plowing expenses in the winter. I believe the approval of the project would benefit our unit owners. I know it would be a pain to put up with a little more traffic in there with the trucks; there are tradeoffs. Our units have already depreciated in value from \$60,000 to \$70,000. Use of the golf course and I already mentioned this, if this is going on, the property values are going to go down more. Having heard rumors that work is being done to secure more favorable development in the future, I would like to note that "a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush". We can't afford to wait for something that might happen. Thank you.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Others?

Mr. Tom Wahl: I live at 401 Lisbon Lane. I have been part of the General Electric Employees Park since 1962 and I have been part of the GE Credit Union so the park means a lot to me and the Credit Union means a lot to me. Also the residents and the Crossings project mean a lot to me. Finally, what I decided to do and I know Ken Wertz feels the same way about it, traffic is a major consideration and we have talked

about it at every Commission meeting, especially myself. I have never missed the opportunity to say that traffic was the major consideration. As I started to think more about it, there are a few other things that popped into my head and I felt like I wanted to put together a white paper because what I really want to do is to be assured that whatever we put in here is very successful. So I thought a good thing would be like a "lessons learned" from what we did with the project in 2003. If you will bear with me, I will read it to you.

"The residents who purchased condos at Crossings at the Park have devoted a good part of their lives to enable them to live in an upscale senior's community. The PUD approved in 2003, if successful, would have assured them that opportunity. Unfortunately, it did not go that way. Note that in 2003, the PUD was based on a development plan that would provide for the financial security of the Park for at least fifty additional years. The PUD focused on developing the least-used property in the Park, while maintaining or improving the golf course and with value to the GEEAA Association in three specific areas, namely a senior's fifty-five and over condominium community, an assisted living and nursing care facility, and specialty retail. The total value in the PUD for the thirty-three acres was in the neighborhood of \$5M, I think actually \$4.7M. The development did not make it for a number of reasons, including the economy and the inability of the developer to complete the retail, which would have accounted for over half of the value going to GEEAA Park. I believe the lack of a traffic signal on State Route 747 and the housing and financial crises had a negative impact on that attempted development as well. The potential Preliminary Development Plan named Tri-County Commerce Park, with elimination of the golf course and an additional thirty plus acres of picnic and greenspace, impacts what was anticipated by the residents in a significant way. With that said, the property certainly needs to be developed. The potential developer has worked very hard and has been very professional to try to accomplish that. The big issue that I have expressed in all of the past Planning Commission meetings for the new proposed PUD is traffic concerns with excessive cars and trucks in and out of the senior housing community. I have concerns with senior's wellbeing attempting to enter or to exit with several trucks passing by at the same time while they are trying to accomplish this. With fifty-three years of membership at GEEAA and the Credit Union, of further concern is the possibility that the value of this PUD to GEEAA, based on Springdale's imposed restrictions, zoning and buffer areas could be as low as the value noted above in the 2003 PUD for the ten-acre retail development alone. This just doesn't seem right to me; it just doesn't seem like it makes any sense. Yet the approximate seventy acres that represents the current golf course is an issue as courses are overdeveloped in this area and many of them have financial concerns; in fact, I think that you would almost state that almost all of them do. Yes, warehouses appear to be everywhere with a lot of available space and office buildings saturate this community as well. I would hate to further experience the failure of this project, which could create catastrophic difficulties for all parties involved. There is no guarantee that this will not happen. The 2003 PUD is a good example of lessons learned. I learned recently that the owner of the six acres of land from the 2003 PUD has that property for sale; that would indicate to me that they have no interest to build inside the park facility. I believe that a senior's project, like the one planned in 2003 would be ideal within the Park and that a good location for it is where the new potential development has located Building #3. The elimination of that proposed warehouse and building could provide for such a senior's facility. The six acres should, with such use, create a higher value also for that property while also helping our fifty-five and over community as well. Further, the elimination of Building #4, with a small retail development would also represent a higher value to GEEAA and provide a more mixed use of the property. This would make the major development in the east of the property, thereby abating some of the traffic concerns and issues for the senior's community in the western section of the property, while lowering the possibility of project failure due to over-saturation of warehouse and office concentrations. Further, the traffic left-turn signal with active operation period, in my opinion, would have a major positive impact on traffic issues for all the above mentioned. This could be similar to the light that allows southbound Route 747 traffic the opportunity for safe entrance into Staples. Vandercar would be right sized to four warehouses and three office facilities and I

would like to see them accomplish that. I think it is a good use for the property. I would hope that this creates a better opportunity for their success because at this stage, as I mentioned, failure is not an option. Additionally, this would create a better situation for the residents by providing for a shorter build-out time which I believe was noted to be somewhere in the area of eight years. So, my way of looking at this, it is kind of a "win-win" for everybody and the big question is how do we make this a "win" for all concerned?"

That is the end of my white paper and I will sign it; thank you.

Chairman Darby: Thank you, Mr. Wahl. As others comes, the Chair is very mindful of the fact that this is a very serious issue for everyone who chose to come out and for many others. We don't have a time clock up here but I would ask that you, in conveying your thoughts, would please try to be mindful of everyone's time. Next?

Mr. Tom Vanover: I am Tom Vanover, 11982 Tavel Court. Just the last speaker, I wasn't quite sure what side of the fence he was on, but it was pointing a finger, which I take offense to, at the City and quite honestly, I've said it before and I'll say it again – the situation we're in right now occurred twenty-seven years ago and it was because of the management in the group that was running GEEAA Park. The City has numerous times at that point we had a letter of first right of refusal of any offer. That was ignored, thrown out the window, and we never saw it. We offered to buy the course and let you lease it for a dollar for one hundred years, something like that and that was turned down. So there's enough blame to go around, but just remember, and I'll use the old saying my grandmother always taught me, "If you point your finger at somebody, you got three of them coming back at you."

Chairman Darby: Mr. Vanover, we are going to deal with the issue that is before us.

Mr. Vanover: I am done with that, yes. But what we have before us, I still have concerns. The biggest question mark out there is that we don't know what is coming. On the development for this development - Mr. Shveg zda, it was brought up before and a neighbor asked me the question - is there a controlled release from those detention ponds into the creek and what is it?

Mr. Shveg zda: Yes, it would be a controlled release right and that would be basically twenty-five year, pre-developed flow from all of those tributary areas.

Mr. Vanover: Okay, alright. There's been a lot thrown out. I've said before, in my ideal world, this wouldn't be. But I also read no reality in where we are and what is going on. There's a lot of things that are on the horizon that are even more scary than this. I guess after a lot of soul-searching and consideration, this isn't my first choice but I will have to say that there could be worse; the worse concerns me more. We still have control of the development coming in, as far as the individual occupants themselves and that's good. I have full faith in your work. That said, the neighborhood Heritage Hill, my neighborhood, is probably the most protected. The ladies that I have talked to on an ongoing basis in the Crossings, I'd love to hear their comments because they're going to be the ones that really look at the front door of this. You are right, something is going to go there. This is the plan we have. The question is, contrary to what developers always tell us that it is the highest and best use, that just means that you put as much in as small area as you can get. But is this the question the Planning Commission has to answer? Is this the best for the City, for the residents - you know, the total package? I clearly state that I'm not accepting defeat but I know that there are other things out there that have reared their head, if you will say, that concern me more coming onto this property than what part of this does. So that's my statement, my concern. Part of that is for the future, that we don't know what's coming. With that, I'll relinquish the floor.

Mr. Gene Neff: I am here to represent the GEEAA. I have been around for a long time and I have had responsibilities working for the General Electric Company as well as a lot of actual background with the GEEAA. I hear a lot of rumors, a lot of comments and I just wanted to make a few things straight and I heard a comment that we were not going to close the golf course - it was officially closed forever today, after fifty-one

years of operation. I was there today when we had our rental carts taken away. After being involved with that for so long, it is not that we didn't try to keep the golf course going, it is just a financial impossibility. We have lost money the last number of years and if it wasn't for the GE Credit Union, we actually would have been out of business long before now. It all comes down to money and one thing that people still think that the General Electric, GE Aircraft Engines, owns the park and they have absolutely nothing to do with it. There was a time back in 1949 when the organization was organized that the company did help us and they did actually give us a subsidy; we haven't gotten a subsidy in the last three or four years. We are completely separated from the company. There are a few little things that they do for us and we have tried to talk to them about this project but they do not and they will not back us. It is over as far as the GEEAA is concerned. All we are trying to do now is to pay our debt because we have lost a lot of money the last few years trying to keep it going. We have a lot of dedicated employees. We have a greens keeper that has been with us thirty-two years. We have a couple of other employees that have been with us fifty years. Today we had to lay off those people. We are down to the last straw for us. This developer is trying the best they can to make this thing work. We have no other options. I thought I would let everybody know that the course is closed and today was the last day.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Neff, if you taught me better, I would be a better golfer.

Mr. Neff: Sorry about that.

Ms. Diane Breakall: I am Diane Breakall from 212 Edinburgh Lane. I want you to think very carefully before you vote in favor of the warehouses. The Crossings at the Park, we are all seniors and some of us are suffering from cardiovascular and pulmonary disease and we already have the pollution from 747 and 275 and if we add all of those trucks with the warehouses and the vehicles for the one thousand employees, the carbon emission would be so much greater and we don't need more pollution; besides all of the noise it would cause. We won't be able to get out of that place. It is hard now to get out at 747. Even if you put a light on Crescentville and we try to get out over there, we'll be sandwiched between all the trucks. So, please think about it. Thank you.

Chairman Darby: Thank you.

Mr. Chris Vaughn: I just moved into 972 Ledro, so I will be in direct line of Building #1, I guess. I also represent my grandfather, who could unfortunately not make it this evening - he is ninety-two and he has had some health issues and his name is Roy Bertram. Back to the golf course, I grew up on that course, my grandfather has been there since the 1930's. My mother grew up there. I have gone out to the back and hit golf balls into that course, myself. I get a house less than a month and a half ago and I find out that this is happening. So that is where I am. Unfortunately, as everyone has so eloquently put, the reality is that something has to go in there. Despite my urging of you guys to reject this plan, I still feel that something like it is going to be beneficial to our City, minus the traffic issues. I am not sure there is anything that can be done, I am not sure what is up for debate as far as what is going to go in there and how far along we are in the process of development. Are there any other ideas that you are going to entertain to address some of these concerns down the road? I do have direct questions for this gentleman as well. What is really up for debate as far as the plan, what is going to go in and where it is going to be?

Chairman Darby: You have sat through a presentation which explained the plan on the table at this time.

Mr. Vaughn: So there is no debate as to where these buildings are going to go?

Chairman Darby: Mrs. McBride, I think you could more eloquently discuss that.

Mrs. McBride: What is up on the screen is, I will say, the developer's best guess at this point and time as to where buildings would go. But there is text that accompanies

that plan that establishes setbacks and so forth that are different than what is on the plan. I used Building #1 as an example; that it could be much closer to Crescentville Road than is shown on there; just for example. If this development was to be recommended by Planning Commission and ultimately approved by Council, every one of those lots would have to come back to this Commission for review and approval for things like what the buildings will look like and signage and landscaping and lighting and all of those kinds of things.

Mr. Vaughn: Well, I think another thing to think about too is the lay of the land here. I am not sure if anyone that doesn't live on that street is not quite aware of, a 40' building where Building #1 is actually going to be sitting is probably going to be like a 90' building based on the level of land - it is a hill. So that building is going to be sitting quite high. I saw a line of sight presented from Vandercar, I guess it was a month ago, that showed some kind of a mound with a line of sight to the building which I did not find very accurate. I am actually a designer and I work in the jet engine world myself so I kind of deal with line of sight a lot when I am modeling in the computer and I can tell you that line of sight was not accurate.

Chairman Darby: We're comfortable, based on Staff's input, that the presentation made to us by the developer was accurate.

Mr. Vaughn: Well they did not show you the lay of the land, the hill that it is sitting on.

Chairman Darby: It took into consideration everything that needed to be taken into consideration to be presented accurately.

Mr. Vaughn: Well that leads me to my next question, what exactly is this mound going to be? I don't see it pictured. I do see the offset of Buildings #1 and #2; I don't see a real hashed-out plan of what is going to be going in that space. I think there was a line in whoever had written that statement that was read earlier, that said something about putting a common space in there, which was my direct thought. Instead of building a mound which would cost something, you could leave it flat with a tree line in there and allow the residents of Heritage Hill to use that space as a park; bring over some of the existing structures in the old park and put them in that place instead of a mound, something that would help the value of the property rather than degrade from it. It is already going to be a loss as it is; we are already going to be losing everything along that line and I am not sure what the amount is. I guess there is nothing that can be done for that so it would be great to better use that space if there are no other options out there of how to rotate those buildings around counter clockwise so that they are not facing that side of Heritage Hill.

Chairman Darby: After great due diligence, and I would ask others to share their thoughts, creating a buffer between the residences and the development, doing something to deal with the height of the buildings and also just providing a more aesthetically-pleasing setting, a mound was developed. The inputs we have gotten from our professionals and the presenters is that a mound really enhances the existence of that development for the residents versus flat land.

Mr. Vaughn: That is an interesting finding. I would have thought that the comments raised to be left as a park would have actually been more beneficial to the residents. If there is any way that they could just rotate the plan around counter clockwise 90° or clockwise 90° to avoid having loading docks facing Heritage Hill would be also a great benefit to our neighborhood as well. I am not sure what anybody is entertaining at this point, but I figured I would just come up and speak my mind.

Chairman Darby: We appreciate your input. Thank you.

Mr. Ken Ruzick: I live at 509 Salzburg within Crossings at the Park Condominium Community. I have been at all of the meetings over these last several months and I have listened very carefully, not only Planning Commission but also City Council. This developer has had a plan over these last months, there has been modifications in

great detail to that plan and they have all been at the suggestions of citizens and the Planning Commission's recommendations and observations. It seems to be that all of those have essentially been met in this new modified plan. As a resident of Crossings at the Park, I especially am totally in favor of the revised plans and I recommend approval by this Commission.

Chairman Darby: Thank you, Mr. Ruzick.

Mrs. Joann Bachmann: My name is Joann Bachmann; I live at 405 Lisbon Lane. My very short comment is to second what he said. I think he spoke very succinctly ... (off microphone) ... We cannot leave this property undeveloped, so I heartily agree with what he said.

Mrs. Patty Grist: My name is Patty Grist; I live at 417 Lisbon Lane. I have a question that I have pondered ever since I have seen the design - what happens with the pond? The pond that is up there right now used to come down behind my home. Are we moving the pond? - that is my question.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Shvegza, could you answer that please?

Mr. Shvegza: The existing pond will remain as it is.

Mrs. Grist: As it is. Okay, because it is not drawn like that. Thank you.

Chairman Darby: Are there any fish in it? I'll be over. Are there others?

Mrs. Barbara Boyd: My name is Barbara Boyd and I am a resident of 506 Salzburg, in fact, I am a new resident. I have only been there a few months and these people are scaring the heck of me. No seriously, I just want to say that I love it where I am and I appreciate what Mr. Ken Ruzick has said. We need to do something with that property for all concerned. So, thank you - I just wanted to voice that.

Chairman Darby: Seeing there are no others wishing to speak, we will close this session of the presentation and get our Commission Members involved.

Mrs. Boice: I will start off this discussion. When I received my packet over the weekend in preparation for the meeting tonight - well, first of all, I thank all of you for coming. This has been quite a process and many of you have been very dedicated in your attendance and your approach to the microphone has always been very positive and we all appreciate that. We appreciate you keeping tabs in what is going on in the City because that is important. As far as Vandercar is concerned, it is my observance that every issue that Planning Commission has raised from the building size to the setbacks to the outside storage, which I am going to be very honest with you that I was really shocked when I got this revised plan and hooray - there isn't going to be any outside storage. I really was taken away by that because I had not expected that. I thought maybe a reduction in size, some screening, that type of thing. Rather than go into a lot of detail, because I know the other Members have their comments, as I look at the listing here of all of the things that we had discussed - outdoor storage, the reduction of Building #1, the reduction of Building #2, the reduction in heights, setbacks, buffer yards - this to me has been a really productive give and take. What we have suggested and what you have suggested and I know some of you have had some meetings with Vandercar - the residents. Of course I have not been there and I don't know what all was covered but from some of the comments that I have heard I felt that they had apparently had covered and answered all of your questions. This piece of property has been kind of a very active discussion piece of property in this community for quite some time. We would all love to have the golf course there permanently, of course, but times change and we already have one golf course in Springdale, as you well know, near the Glendale area of the City of Springdale. What we would all like of course is wonderful greenspace and wonderful parks and that type of thing. But in this particular instance, that is a large block of land and there is no way the City can possibly keep that up. There is a certain amount of tax dollars that are spend and they are spent wisely in this City, there is no question about that.

We have elected officials here who are very careful with what they do with your money, believe me. But it is just not feasible. I wish too that we could have something glorious and beautiful and all of these wonderful things but that just isn't in the works. When you talk retail, look around at retail in the City, right now. Tri-County is working very hard to get their area filled up. Go up to Forest Fair/Cincinnati Mills, whatever it is called, it has changed hands how many times, and they can't fill the place up. So retail is something we have in our community right now. I cannot see retail going in there. I, in closing, would like to thank Vandercar for answering and trying to meet all of the questions and all of the changes that we required. As I said, I think it has been a very good give and take. Again, I thank all of you for the interest you have taken. I also would like to add, when all this is over and I said this same thing many, many years ago, Council loves having their Chambers filled, they love having the people come in so that you know what is going on in the City. So, don't let just this one item - come to Council meetings, come to Planning meetings, come and find out what is going in your City. Your elected officials want that feedback and they love hearing from you. So thank you again for coming and I would hope that we are going to resolve this issue. I know not everybody will be happy no matter which way we go. Thank you, it has been our pleasure having you here.

Chairman Darby: Mrs. Boice, thanks for coming back - that was great. First, I want you to feel sorry for me. When Mayor French first appointed me to Planning Commission way back, the number one item on our agenda was Shopco. Some of you know where I am going. Now my good friend, Mayor Webster, chose to appoint me again and it takes me right back to GEEAA Park. Tough decisions to make, tough decisions. This is the politics season, so you hear people talking about how they have evolved. As I make my comments, you will sense that I have evolved. But this has been a very thorough process and during this process, I have learned a lot. It's been a fair process. One person said "fair" is where you go to judge pigs but that is not the case. This has been fair because not only have we, but Council, has tried to listen. I know the Mayor, the City Administrator, have listened to individuals and small groups but also we had to listen to the developer and we have to be fair to the developer. They have responded very well through the inputs they received from us. I don't think they were always happy to do it but they're professionals and they did it. I think they have gotten to a place now which is not necessarily what you see up there, as Mrs. McBride explained, it is a preliminary plan but it appears to be something for this time, for this City, for that location which is workable. I'm going to ask now if there are other Members who would like to comment.

Mrs. Harlow: I'd like to comment that this has been a very difficult process to work through. I realize, like everyone else has said, GEEAA Park is not going to be there but something is going to be there. We have to work with the developer that comes forward with the plan and the money to do the plan. And I do thank Vandercar for listening to what the City has asked and what Planning has asked in working on that with us. Again, none of these decisions are made easily. We try to take into consideration our Heritage Hill residents and our Crossing residents to make sure that we try to protect each group of residents as much as possible - that has been my goal in all of this. Thank you.

Mr. Bauer: I'd like to make a motion to approve the GEEAA Park redevelopment Major PUD Modifications and Preliminary Development Plan to include specifications and designs contained in the exhibits as submitted and reviewed by Staff, with the following conditions, that they include all staff comments, Building Department, City Engineer, and City Planner recommendations and considerations and to include that the loading consideration shall be reevaluated during Final Development Plan and that any chemical, biological, hazardous material uses in the development be reevaluated also during the Final Redevelopment Plan.

(Mrs. Ghantous seconded the motion. With six "aye" votes from the Planning Commission Members, the motion was approved with conditions.)

Chairman Darby: With six positive votes, it is approved. Congratulations.

VIII. DISCUSSION

- A. Chairman Darby: I am in receipt of a memo from the Hamilton County Regional Planning Commission. We are to submit the name of a nominee for membership for that commission. In the past, it has been Dave Okum, who unfortunately is not here today. We spoke about this at the last meeting and I know that Dave is willing to do this but I will accept nominations for membership on the Regional Planning Commission.

Mrs. Ghantous: I nominate Dave Okum.

Chairman Darby: I hereby rule the nominations closed. I have so much power. We will take a vote by affirmation to send Dave Okum to the Regional Planning Commission. All those in favor?

(The Planning Commission Members unanimously appointed Mr. Dave Okum as representative to the Regional Planning Commission.)

- B. Mr. Diehl: This is probably going to be my last Planning Commission that I am going to attend. Mrs. Harlow had told you at the beginning of the meeting that we have a change on Council. One of our Council Members resigned who was in District 1. I live in District 1 and I am going to try to seek that office. Our Charter mandates that for the two Council People, one be from District and one be at large. Since I'm at large and moving into District, hopefully, I'm no longer going to be able to attend. I wanted to thank this Committee for all that you do for the City. This is such a great committee for the whole City, how we work, and I am really proud to be a Member of this Committee. Mrs. Boice, I hope you stay for another 50 years.

Mrs. Boice: That is very kind of you, but a question for you, Mr. Diehl – you say that you are leaving – are you vacating your seat on Council for your term?

Mr. Diehl: No, I am a Councilman at large. I hope to be a Council person for District 1.

Mrs. Boice: Okay, but are you not going to complete and continue on here?

Mr. Diehl: Well, our Charter requires one Member to be at large and one member to be District. Since Mrs. Harlow is already a District person, we don't need two of us.

Mrs. Boice: But you, right now are at large, are you not?

Mr. Diehl: I am. That's probably going to change shortly.

Mrs. Boice: I'll talk to you about it later. With the elections coming up, I am not quite clear how that happens; certainly you can't flip flop seats. You see I've stayed around too long.

Chairman Darby: If it is in fact your last meeting, I hope it is not - I want to thank you for what you have given us - your maturity and your sense of commonsense have really helped us. You don't talk all the time but when you say it, people listen. Thank you.

Mr. Diehl: Thank you.

- C. Mrs. Ghantous: What is next with the new Zoning Code?

Mrs. McBride: It is anticipated that the new Zoning Code will be presented to Planning Commission at the October meeting for your review and recommendation on to Council.

Mrs. Ghantous: So the revisions or the things that we discussed as a group have been implemented and then we are just going to talk about it?

Mrs. McBride: Yes, correct. And you will be getting, in advance of that meeting, two things – one, a clean draft and two, a red-line draft showing those revisions.

Mrs. Ghantous: Good, thank you.

IX. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

(No Chairman's report presented at this meeting.)

X. ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. Boice moved to adjourn, Mr. Diehl seconded and the City of Springdale Planning Commission meeting concluded at 8:40 p.m. The next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for October 13th, 2015.

Respectfully submitted,

_____, 2015 _____
Don Darby, Chairman

_____, 2015 _____
Richard Bauer, Secretary