

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

December 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, Don Darby, Tom Hall, Marjorie Harlow,
Lawrence Hawkins, Joe Ramirez

Member Absent: Dave Okum

Staff Present: Mrs. McBride and Elizabeth Fields, City Planner;
Don Shvegza, City Engineer; Gregg Taylor, Building Official

III. MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF NOVEMBER 10, 2015

Chairman Darby: At this time the Chair will accept a motion to adopt the Minutes of our previous meeting of November 10th, 2015.

Mrs. Harlow: Move to adopt.

(Mr. Hawkins seconded the motion. With four "aye" votes from the Planning Commission Members, the November 10th, 2015 Minutes were adopted as submitted; with two abstentions by Mr. Hall and Mr. Ramirez who were not present at the November 2015 Planning Commission meeting.)

IV. REPORT ON COUNCIL

Mrs. Harlow provided a report of the December 1st Special City Council Meeting regarding the swearing-in ceremony welcoming back to City Council Mr. Lawrence Hawkins and welcoming two new Council Members, Mr. Shroyer and Mrs. Ghantous; including the swearing in of Mrs. McNear and Mayor Webster and the election of Mr. Vanover as President and Mr. Hawkins as Vice President of Council. Mrs. Harlow additionally provided a summary report of the December 2nd, 2015 City Council meeting.

V. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Chairman Darby: The floor will be open for nomination of Chair for the upcoming year.

Mrs. Harlow: I would like to nominate Mr. Darby, if he is willing.

Chairman Darby: Thank you very much.

(With no additional nominations presented and a unanimous "aye" vote, Mr. Darby was affirmed to continue as Chairman of the Planning Commission.)

Chairman Darby: Thank you very much and I will do my best to serve this position. Second, we will accept nominations for Vice Chair; at this current time, that position is held by Mr. Okum.

Mr. Hawkins: I nominate David Okum for Vice Chair.

(With no additional nominations presented for Vice Chair, and with a unanimous "aye" vote from the Planning Commission Members present, Mr. Okum was affirmed as the Vice Chairman of the Planning Commission.)

Chairman Darby: Now the Chair will accept nominations for the position of Secretary.

Mr. Hawkins: I nominate for Secretary Mr. Bauer.

(No additional nominations presented for Secretary and with a unanimous "aye" vote, Mr. Bauer was affirmed as the Secretary of the Planning Commission.)

Chairman Darby: We also need to select a person as our representative from the Planning Commission as liaison to the Board of Zoning Appeals; previously that was Mrs. Ghantous. The Chair will accept a nomination for that position.

Mr. Hawkins: I nominate Mr. Ramirez.

(With no additional nominations presented for liaison to the Board of Zoning Appeals and with a unanimous "aye" vote from the Planning Commission Members present, Mr. Ramirez was affirmed as the Planning Commission liaison to BZA.)

Chairman Darby: That closes the election of officers.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

Oak Hills Mausoleum and Gardens Development Concept Plan Review, 11200 Princeton Pike

Chairman Darby: Good evening. It is our procedure that you give us a brief overview.

Mr. Foster: Sure, good evening. My name is Tim Foster and I am with Infrastructure and Development Engineering, Inc. We are the Civil Engineer assisting Spring Grove with the Oak Hill Mausoleum and loop road development. While you may have seen some plans that show a lot of their future development ideas, we are very much focused on just the mausoleum development project for which we are developing civil drawings for. This development would include a mausoleum structure which will be greater than 16' in height and it will also include a loop road or a bell road from the existing drive off of Princeton Pike at the north entrance of Oak Hill Cemetery. As of this moment, our plans do not include this project widening any of that existing infrastructure there so this will be a new loop road coming off of that existing drive that is in the cemetery at this moment. There will be future development of gardens to the north of that mausoleum for which we are planning storm connections and things like that but the civil drawings that we are moving forward at this point is only for Phase I which is just the loop road and just the mausoleum structure. If you have any questions.

Mrs. McBride: They are before you tonight for concept plan discussion, so there wouldn't be any formal action by the Commission but I think they are looking for input that could be incorporated into their formal submittal which you could hear next month or whenever they decide to submit.

(Mrs. McBride and Mr. Shvezda presented their Staff reports at this time.)

Chairman Darby: Do we have any questions or comments from the Commission Members? Well, I have one that I would like you to expound on a little bit based on comments by Mrs. McBride. Everyone knows that you folks know how to do cemeteries, looking at your affiliations and your history in that but as you are approaching a new venture here, Mrs. McBride's comment about the parking, you have an opportunity to make it a much better situation for the population she mentioned; do you have any discussion about that.

Mr. Foster: Right, I will be somewhat limited in my ability to convey sort of the expertise of the cemetery folks but my understanding is that a 24' street having an 8' path and an 8' path and an 8' path is generally the acceptable and standard across cemeteries for having that on-street parking. Beyond that there is not a whole lot more that I can comment on because that was the intent from everything we have been communicated with since the beginning and we have been on this project for about two months now.

Chairman Darby: And also it is your feeling that two ADA parking spaces is going to be sufficient, again considering.

Mr. Foster: My understanding is normally in a situation where the grades might be less severe there wouldn't be a need for a situation like that but because of the grades in this area, the planning team felt it was necessary and a very good idea to have some additional beyond normal parking arrangements, especially for a mausoleum type in this area due to the density of it in that area and then with the grades flowing up the street it is going to be more difficult especially for the ADA parking concern.

Mr. Hawkins: Piggy backing on the Chairman's comments regarding parking, is the thought process to have and I know it is talking about a one-way loop, is the thought process to have parking on both sides of that loop?

Mr. Foster: The intent would for it to not be a one-way street. The other streets throughout the cemetery are also not meant to be one-way. There's plans for a future road to come off of this loop toward future cemetery spaces in the rear or to the north and because of that it would make a one-way street rather difficult in that area. There won't be any specific controls on one-way traffic or which side of the road parking would be allowed on.

Mr. Hawkins: So, the idea is to have parking in the loop, right?

Mr. Foster: Right.

Mr. Hawkins: Okay, but we are talking about it not being one-way and so at some point I guess you guys have to figure out if it is not going to be one-way and you are going to allow parking in the loop, both people can't park on their right side as they are going through there, there is not going to be room. So, that is something for you guys to think about. The other thing in terms of parking, handicap places, do you guys have any idea based on history in terms of what type of frequency people are going to be coming to the mausoleum or coming to these grounds; obviously as it continues to expand through phases there is likely to be more people but is there any kind of basis of study that you have for what kind of frequency people are going to be visiting the site?

Mr. Foster: I would say definitely. I don't have that information with me tonight but I would say absolutely. Because of the density of the mausoleum, it is going to have much more concentrated visitation than the more sparse grass throughout the rest of the cemetery but we can definitely provide that information.

Mr. Hawkins: Inside the mausoleum halls, what is the lighting going to be like?

Mr. Foster: My understanding there will be lighting on the interior, I don't know the specific type of lighting on the inside but there is electric plan to the structure and artificial lighting on the inside of those; they are going to be recessed lighting so my understanding is it is not going to be on the exterior of the building.

Mr. Hawkins: Okay, so recessed lighting on the inside?

Mr. Foster: In my understanding, yes.

Mr. Hawkins: Last question, as Mrs. McBride asked about odor, to the extent that you know what is the process like in terms of bodies being placed inside the crypt, are they inside a vault or inside a casket, what is that process like if you know?

Mr. Foster: That is a very good question and unfortunately I am not in a position to definitely answer that. I would say that I have not been privy to that discussion, I apologize.

Mr. Hawkins: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. McBride: I guess if you choose to come back for development plan consideration before the Commission, I would ask that maybe we could get some cemetery folks here because I think that there could be some concerns about odor given its proximity to some of our other land uses, restaurants and so forth. I know that if you google the issue, it can

be an issue and has been an issue in other communities, so we want to make sure it is not going to be an issue here in Springdale. The other thing with regards to design, and Mr. Shvezgda may have some comments on that as well, if it is a 24' wide street and you are going to allow parking on both sides and it is typically a 12' drive isle then you can see you are obviously not going to get a car through there, let alone a fire truck or an ambulance. I think that you need to take a good look at how you are going to handle that parking and whether it is going to be a one-way street system, you have indicated that probably wouldn't be optimal in this situation and are you only going to allow parking on one side if there is going to be parking provided if the roadway is going to widen at the point near the mausoleum. We just want to make sure that there is adequate safe parking and at the same time we can get emergency vehicles through there, should we need to.

Mr. Bauer: Just to echo parking and the loop road that Mrs. McBride brought up, I was just going to ask code requirements for parking, the way you want to park and with the double, not a one-way street. We ought to be looking at that and maximizing that. I can envision quite a bit of traffic at that mausoleum just by the numbers that you have provided in this paper tonight. That would be a big concern of mine, to have adequate parking there and that we are not running cars into each other; we need to look at that real closely. My second question would be on the height of the building, I am a little confused I guess. The principle building is allowed to be 50', but is the mausoleum the principle building at that facility?

Mrs. McBride: No. As we indicated it would be an accessory structure which is allowed to be a maximum of 16' in height. If they are going to exceed that they would need to go to the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Mr. Bauer: Why is it considered an accessory building? Is there another building there on site?

Mrs. McBride: There is another building on site, is my understanding.

Mr. Bauer: Okay.

Mrs. McBride: So, this would be considered an accessory building and I believe that they are going to have multiple other buildings in their long-range plan, as well.

Mr. Bauer: Thank you. So, you say it is going to exceed 16', is there no idea how much it is going to exceed 16'?

Mr. Foster: Yes, it will be closer to 32' at the peak because of the preliminary architectural drawings; 16' is generally going to be the height of the structure at the corners. It was communicated post this document being submitted.

Mr. Bauer: So it will pretty much look like what we are seeing in this document?

Mr. Foster: Yes. We just didn't have a specific height showing.

Mr. Bauer: I mean 32' is twice 16', so I guess you are looking at that and we will address those issues when you come back. Thank you.

Mr. Ramirez: My question is on the operational hours, when people will be able to visit this mausoleum and if it will be open after dark. Have you made provisions for lighting this access loop?

Mr. Foster: I don't believe there is provision for lighting the drive, providing street lighting. Hours of operation, in my understanding is that it would only be open during the cemetery hours; though if there are plans for after hours, I am not aware of them.

Mrs. Harlow: I am familiar with the mausoleum concept, it is at a cemetery over in Northern Kentucky that I go to a lot. They have it sitting up high on a hill and it is very impressive, it has a very large center area very similar to this. So I wasn't very surprised at the 32' at the peak. I think my question is, this is Phase I and eventually you have garden

mausoleum so eventually there will be other mausoleums behind this one; is that correct from what I am looking at?

Mr. Foster: Yes.

Mrs. Harlow: What is the actual acreage that we have at this facility?

Mr. Foster: For Phase I or including the future?

Mrs. Harlow: The whole acreage for the facility?

Mr. Foster: The entire site is 86 acres.

Mrs. Harlow: Okay. For Phase I, what have they set aside for that in the acreage?

Mr. Foster: The current disturbance is 1.26 acres and .36 acres of that is hard surface.

Mrs. Harlow: And that is the pink area going around?

Mr. Foster: That is the asphalt, the pink surface which is a concrete walkway and the mausoleum roof.

Mrs. Harlow: Thank you.

Chairman Darby: I don't see any other lights. I think one of the messages that came through this evening in our brief discussion and we appreciate the information that you shared, but as Mrs. McBride has indicated in future appearances you probably need to bring some of the folks who deal in areas that you don't because there are a number of questions and could be more. Thank you for coming.

Mr. Foster: I understand. Thank you.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

New Zoning Code / Zoning Code Update

Mrs. McBride: We have been, as most all of you know, working on an update of the Springdale Zoning Code for quite a while. We had a steering committee that met once a month for about a year and we have done several rounds of comments. We did a presentation with most of the City folks one Saturday and had a good discussion out of that. We also got additional comments from different folks and we have incorporated those. I am going to have Liz Fields walk you through where we are with it and we are hoping to, if the Commission is agreeable, get a recommendation to go ahead and get this sent onto Council for consideration.

Ms. Elizabeth Fields: Anne went through sort of the summary of what we have been through for the past almost year and a half. We started this process with a diagnosis of your existing Code and then established an outline for how the new Code update was going to proceed; that is how the process began, starting back in August 2014. Each section of the Code has been reviewed by your Law Director and his comments have been incorporated into the new Code. The Review Committee Members spanned BZA, City Council, and Planning Commission and their names are up there. They all did a great job attending monthly meetings and reviewing the sections and providing their comments in talking through some very, very lengthy discussions about topics of the Zoning Code. From the diagnosis four goals were identified for the update, shown here. These goals, we will kind of go through them one by one and described how these goals were implemented into the new Code. This is a very similar presentation to what we did in July, so I am going to hit the high-points because most of you were here in July for our Saturday workshop. I would be happy to go into any of these details in more detail if any of you so desire. Reorganizing and reformatting the Code, one of the first complaints from the City was that it is very hard to find information within your existing Code. The sections are kind of oddly laid out and it is not the easiest Code to navigate. So we looked to see how

we could better organize the Code, establish kind of standard sections so that everything is in a logical order and place. I know the graphics are going to be hard to see but they are the exact same thing that you have in the Code in front of you so you can ignore the blurry graphics on the screen, but we made sure that the Code itself was easy to navigate within, establishing a hierarchy of subsections, improving references. The PDF of this Code has a lot of cross-references, so that if it references another section of the Code it will be a blue-link, if you click on will take you right to that section. I am not sure and we need to still figure out how the PDF will be taken into the online process but the PDF that we have, the final one is really easy to navigate on your computer. We also illustrated a lot more key concepts and processes to provide some more visual examples of the concepts that we are talking about within the Code.

The next goal is to clarify rules and procedures, we wanted it to be clear for the public coming in, for both developers and home owners no matter what process they were going through. That is a really hard thing to see, at least for me but that is the table that has the different review processes. So, whether you are doing a variance or subdivision or a site plan, it will give you the section number that describes how that process is conducted, who their approval body is and so forth. So that is a really nice way to just compare and contrast all the different processes within the City and who is responsible for approving and reviewing each process. We also established a table for public hearing requirements for the different processes, which applications need a public hearing and what the public hearing requirements are for each process, for public notice, for paper notifications and for mailing notifications; this is also a really nice resource to clearly see what the public hearing notifications are with each process.

The third goal is to evaluate the district's structures and the use regulations and the definitions, which was one of those longer goals. One of the first things that we did quite a while ago for all of us, was look at all of the zoning districts and see how we can simplify. The list on the left is all your current zoning districts, as you can see a very lengthy list for your City. The number of single-family and multi-family districts, the three Public Facility (PF) districts; when we looked at them a lot of them are very similar in nature and so it made sense to combine these and consolidate a couple of these down into one district, just for the ease of both the City and those property owners, specifically we combined the Residential Single Household Medium Density (RSH-M) with the Residential Single Household Low Density (RSH-L). The existing low density standards were very similar to the medium density standards and so it made sense to combine those, and again this will only apply to new platted lots, which we don't expect to have a lot of new platted lots. The multi-household districts were also combined into one and so that makes the multi-household areas a little more simplified. Again, notice the Public Facility (PF) districts were combined into one; you currently have low, medium and high density Public Facility (PF) districts which didn't seem quite necessary. Lastly, the Motor Service (MS) district was combined with General Business (GB). Most of those uses overlapped anyway and the few uses that were specific to Motor Service (MS) became conditional uses within the General Business (GB). So, where those uses are appropriate and make sense within the City, they still have the right to apply for those few Motor Service (MS) district uses within the General Business (GB) zoning district but keeping a zone just for that didn't seem necessary any longer. We also reorganized your uses into both a residential and non-residential use table. Currently your Code is separated into the different zoning districts and then within each zoning district it describes which uses are allowed and the standards for that specific zoning district; that makes comparing and contrasting your zoning districts very difficult. This table allows for each use to be identified and then where those uses are allowed within your Code; if the use is a gas station, where that gas station is allowed, both where it is permitted or if it is conditional. On the far right column, if it has any additional standards associated with that use, like a gas station or a drive-through restaurant, there will be a hyperlink that will take you to those additional standards, again in that PDF. It will also have in the table a PS, which stands for permitted with standards so if there are any additional standards that apply to that use it will be identified in the table and again have that hyperlink that will take you to those standards. Since this is a new thing that was included in your Code, some of the examples of uses that have these additional standards are ATMs, fueling stations, laboratories, close-storage facilities, solar farms; kind of unique uses that may have some additional things that apply to them that the City wants to look at with those uses that aren't covered, with setbacks and lot

coverage and building height. We also reviewed the development standards for both the residential and non-residential uses, within each zone, what the setbacks are required within that use, what the setbacks are for both adjacent to residential and non-residential because that changes. For example, the setback for Industrial zoning district to a Residential zoning district is a much greater setback than if you were an Industrial district next to another Industrial district. It also identifies minimum green space and building height, so again this information was spread out through your Code within each zoning district and now it is in one nice convenient table. Currently the definitions are in the beginning of your Code and they were also spread out through your Code. There were some signage definitions within the signage section and there was some in the Planned Unit Development (PUD) district or the Corridor District (CRD) some specific definitions and that makes it difficult for someone looking at your definition section, they are not going to get the full picture. We made sure to take all the definitions from everywhere within the Code and put them in one section and we also moved it to the end of the Code instead of at the beginning of the Code. We also reviewed all the term and updated terms as necessary for the terms that weren't working for you currently. We added new terms for some new uses that were not common when the Code was last updated and we also removed terms that were no longer used within the Code.

The last goal was to modernize the site development standards, so this was again those kind of permitted with standard uses. Looking at the subareas, looking at the PUD district, looking at signage, landscaping, the building design standards, all those things were looked at within your Code and updated. One of the first things was reviewing the Corridor Review Development (CRD) standards and updating that as necessary. We altered the pitched roof requirement in Subarea A, which is the district north of I-275, currently it required a pitched roof on all buildings and we changed that so it was only a pitched roof on buildings that are two stories or less because you don't want a six-storied building with a pitched roof because it would look funny. The signage guidelines for the Corridor and the review procedure for the Corridor, we made it the same review procedure as necessary for the Corridor Review District (CRD) and the Planned Unit Development (PUD). We also reviewed the parking standards and modified those. We reviewed what your parking standards are now and updated those as necessary; one thing we added was for the ability for the Building Official to modify the parking standards plus or minus 10%. If someone is required to have 50 spaces and they have 49, the Building Official can review that and make that change on a Staff level and not require them to go for a variance for something very minor like that. We also added bicycle parking requirements which is a sustainability attempt for the City and a very common requirement in zoning codes currently. We modified the loading space requirements and also added vehicle stacking standards for drive-through for drug stores and fast-food restaurants and car washes. For the signage regulations, this section got a big overhaul, currently there is a very complicated system for how you establish how much signage is allowed on the walls of buildings, instead of having this very complicated system we changed it to a percentage of the building façade and for most structures it is 4% of the building façade to be allowed to have wall signage; bigger buildings can have bigger signage and smaller buildings will have smaller signage. It is a much fairer way to regulate wall signage. We increased the maximum height of ground signs from 7' to 8'; 8' is a much more common height for ground signs but still keeps them lower. Right now the City allows pole signs throughout and with this update we were going to restrict pole signs to only properties that front I-275. Removing pole signs from cities and having those signs go to ground signs over time will really change the look and feel of many of your commercial corridors and can really clean up the visual appearance of those areas. We also reviewed the electronic signs standards and increased the allowance for electronic signs. We discussed this a lot in July and we will discuss it again at the end of the presentation but we are allowing electronic signs at a lot more locations than you previously did. We also put in an allowance for electronic fuel pricers, which are much more common and a much nicer way to look at fuel instead of the designs that may be falling down or not updated. We added a table in the sign section that established the different permitted signs like wall signs, awning signs and which zones those types of signs are allowed. Again, we hyperlinked to the section where the regulations for those types of signs are located. We also added sustainable development practices for solar farms, solar panels and small wind-energy turbines, those are throughout the Code. The bicycle parking was a way to increase sustainability in the City and then increasing the flexibility in

the parking standards; we are encouraging a reduction in the number of parking spaces. Some of the other random ones that were not addressed in the presentation are kind of specifically in those goals, we increased landscaping flexibility to allow for some grouping of trees to allow for vision corridors for different commercial businesses; updating and modernizing the plant list. There were some outdated plants like Ash trees, which no one is planting these days and making sure that list was up to date. We changed the notification requirements for public hearings and making that a more common notification requirement. We added a public hearing for Planning Commission for zone changes; again that is very common in most cities in places where they do have public hearings for planning commissions and councils, so we added that. Also the ability for Staff to review and approve signs that are in line with the sign code. At this point I was going to go into what was changed from the comments from July but I wanted to pause and see if anyone had any questions at this point.

Mr. Hawkins: How did the signage, doing a percentage of the façade, how does that comport with the size of most of the signage that we have in the City right now? Obviously the old ones are grandfathered in and there is no issues but in terms of uniformity going forth, did you find that most of the signs that are currently out there comport or are close to the 4%?

Ms. Elizabeth Fields: I think generally they will be fairly in line, I think where the biggest change is the variance that you see for some of the bigger stores that are set back from the street, the calculations for those usually aren't appropriate and so having it be a percentage of buildings allowed for some bigger signs on those bigger buildings and currently you had a maximum square footage on there, I believe it was 150 s.f. for your maximum square footage for wall signs so any wall sign over 150 s.f. would need a variance. If you are a Lowes set back far from the street, you are going to want a bigger sign than that; it is just standard practice. So, this basically is allowing for the signs that you are currently getting applications for; they are appropriate in size but allow for a little more flexibility.

Mr. Hawkins: Thank you.

Ms. Elizabeth Fields: I put together a memo that you all received that kind of highlighted the changes in the Code from the following the July workshop and also all the changes from July are in red lines in the Code that you received. If you want to scan through those that's fine and if you have any questions on any of the red line I would be happy to answer them. I'll go through these real briefly. One of the comments from July was the coordination of terms, making sure that the terms used in the permitted use table and in the parking table and in the end in the definitions were all the same thing, making sure that the parking table didn't say "gas station" and the use table say "automotive fueling station". We went through and checked and made sure that the terms were coordinated through all those tables and throughout the Code. For the Multi-Household Density, it was previously ten units per acre of the maximum density and that was reduced down to eight units per acre, based on comments. We also added a minimum green space requirement for the Multi-Household zone, it did not have that previously and now it does. We received some information that the solar panel information that I previously had in the Code was a little outdated so I received some updated information and incorporated some new standards for solar panels into the Code to reflect the modern standards.

One of the longer discussions we had in July was about the setback for industrial districts to residential, currently we have proposed a 100' setback from the (GI) district to any residential use or zone; to see if that is appropriate or if that should be increased. I reviewed many other cities and townships zoning resolutions to see where this 100' was in line with other people's standards and generally 100' was one of the higher setbacks. A lot of them didn't have specific setbacks for residential districts, it was just like a 25' or 50' rear and side setback, no matter what was adjacent. I could not find another setback that was greater than 100' from industrial to residential in this area; I looked at the cities and townships kind of surrounding you and in the Cincinnati area. I would propose that a 100' setback is reasonable to continue with and not necessarily to increase. You also don't have very many properties that are residential next to commercial zones so it is not a

common problem throughout the Code even though you do have a couple key properties where this is an issue; it is generally not a very common issues within the City. For the cellular wire communication towers, I received a comment after the July workshop to see if we could add any standards to limit their removal of trees for cell towers and I discussed this with legal counsel and it was not recommended putting anything in the Code that would require someone to not be able to remove a tree to install a cell tower, that the City's tree ordinance would still apply if someone needed to remove trees to install a cell tower. Probably anything stricter than that would not be recommended because of FAA requirements and the kind of legal issues that the City could run into; that sections stayed the same.

For the PUDs we added an allowance; previously we had residential PUDs and commercial PUDs but we did not call for a mixed use PUDs, so the standard for commercial PUDs now also applies to mixed use PUDs and that is called out to make sure that is clear. Lastly, the parking requirement were reviewed and some specific uses were brought up to confirm their appropriateness. So we looked at theaters, retail stores and gas stations/automotive fueling station and relooked at those to make sure that the standard that was in the Code was appropriate. The phasing plan, we added an ability for Planning Commission to approve a phasing plan for parking construction; if an applicant feels that they only need to install a part of the parking at the beginning of the project then Planning Commission can approve that and then the Planning Commission would set some sort of standard for when the applicant would have to install the rest of that parking; so that is not a given, it is a Planning Commission approval. For the electronic signs, we reviewed and revised the minimum hold time for electronic signs that are 8' or lower from eight seconds to twenty-four hours and this was discussed pretty lengthy in July. So, those lower signs on some of your busier corridors would be distracting to have them change every eight seconds so now all those signs will have a minimum hold time of one day, twenty-four hours. They will be allowed to have the electronic sign but they will not be able to change as fast as some of the bigger electronic signs. Then I reviewed the pitch spacing requirements, it was brought up that the standards that we have in the Code may not be strict enough and I reviewed the materials that was provided to from one of the sign companies in the area, from a very common electronic sign producer and I think the proposal in the new Zoning Code is appropriate, if at any time the technology changed drastically then I would recommend relooking at those standards. I think with the technology that is occurring now and with what people are able to buy now and afford now, the minimum standards you have will require good quality signs but not unrealistic quality signs. For the temporary signs, this is one of the items that kind of didn't get a lot of resolution in July; we increased the time limit on banners from 90 days a calendar year to 120 days per year. I know that this may need to be discussed additionally to determine if that 120 days is enough time or how this fits into the yearly allowance for temporary signs to be up year-round. Lastly, per legal counsel's request we had a temporary political sign section and that section was revised by legal counsel to address other temporary signs. There has been some legal battles over content of temporary signs and so they wanted to make sure that the Code would not be vulnerable to legal recourse for the political signs. So, political signs now or other temporary signs that address both political signs and other kind of temporary signs that people may put in their yard, it is the same kind of size and same regulation just not called out specifically as political signs.

For definitions we added new definitions for garage door, accessory apartment, ambulatory health care, convenient store, government building; we missed some definitions that as we were reviewing back through we identified. I know that there has been some recent discussion about the definition of garage door and garage based on some recent zoning issues, so I wanted to make sure that was looked at and made sure that the proposed definition in the Code met the needs of the City to have you have something to enforce the City's regulation. That summarizes my presentation so I would be happy to answer any questions.

Chairman Darby: One thing you said keyed this though, how technologically adaptable are we with this document? One area you mentioned specifically, solar panels, and I think of signage, technology is changing so rapidly. Was there any discussion about and it is hard to anticipate any changes that might come about because we don't know what they are

but what is your sense on how technology could impact some specific areas, specifically solar panels and signs?

Ms. Elizabeth Fields: We tried to make sure that the Code met current technologies and in the near future that we know of. Again, we don't know what new technologies are going to come out. With the Code being this nice PDF organized document right now, it will be really easy in the future for the City to adjust some of these sections and take these back as specific text amendments. If something new comes along or technology changes or you use it and find something that is specifically isn't working the way we anticipated then you would come in and revise that section with a text amendment. Zoning codes should be pretty fluid documents, especially with an overhaul of this size in nature, it is kind of to be expected that over the next couple of years you will find some things that you want to adjust and change and just be open to that possibility.

Chairman Darby: Thank you.

Mrs. Harlow: I have a question Elizabeth, could you go back about three slides, and does it address industrial setbacks?

Ms. Elizabeth Fields: It doesn't talk a lot to that.

Mrs. Harlow: I just think this is important, it could have an impact on the residential areas. Wouldn't we want to increase that? Then they could come in for a variance; I would rather hold their feet to the fire before. Doesn't that make sense that we would want to increase that? In some cases, that's not very much at all.

Mrs. McBride: I think ideally we would not want to see industrial next to single family, ideally we would not like to see that and we would not want to encourage that. Particular instances, if we were to see that I think that we would probably almost always encourage them as a Planned Unit Development (PUD), in which case this Commission and Council then establishes those setbacks. A hundred feet might be appropriate depending on what happened in that one hundred feet. The hundred feet that we are suggesting is at the upper end of what is typically required by other communities and industry standards, not industrial industry standards but zoning industry standards. We have looked at that and I think we have to be careful about being perceived as being overly aggressive or taking perhaps of part of that property. If somebody was to come in and try to obtain a zoning map amendment to do an industrial use, it would be as a PUD and then we could look at that on a case-by-case basis.

Mrs. Harlow: Okay, thank you.

Mrs. McBride: This started out as a Zoning Code update and it really ended up as a total rewrite, which was not exactly what we were expecting but what it has done, as somebody who's been your City Planner for over twenty years, it actually gives us a document that is current with what my other fellow planners have in their communities. So, I am pretty excited to see it get going. But the second thing is this document will be so, so much user friendly to our residents, to developers coming in or engineers that might be trying to check something. A number of the features that Liz mentioned, all of these tables, the illustrations, current definitions, it is just going to make it so much easier for folks to use. I hope then, that in turn will cut down on some of the calls that Mr. Taylor gets or maybe I get, we are always happy to answer those but if someone is researching something at 6:30 at night, we might not be available. It is all going to be right there with links and so forth. The one downside I have to say to that is the City does their Code online a little bit different than some communities, we are a little bit concerned about how those hyperlinks are going to come out by the time they all go through the City website process. The content itself is going to be so much easier for both our residents, our businesses, our developers and so forth to use, and us as Staff; I am really excited about that.

Mr. Taylor: As you all know I am new to this realm and the existing Code for me coming in has been, let's say a challenge. The new Code is certainly easier for me to navigate, so I

feel like if it is easier for me then it is likely to be easier for somebody else that is not familiar with our Code.

Chairman Darby: Great.

Mrs. McBride: I want the Commission to understand and we will say this same thing to Council, it is very likely in about six or eight months to a year that we will be coming back to you with a list of text amendments. You are going to say, wait a minute we just did this Code. We can't anticipate everything and maybe there is something that isn't working quite the way that we thought it was going to work or there may be things we missed, though I don't think so. In all likelihood we will be coming back. It is similar to when you buy a car or house, a punch list. I just don't want the Commission to be surprised if we come back with a few things. Gregg and I will be keeping a list of things that we think we could tweak to do a little bit better. That's my last comment.

Chairman Darby: You need a motion tonight. Discussion being completed, we'll accept a motion that we recommend the document to Council.

Mr. Bauer: I'll make that motion that we recommend it to Council. (Mr. Hall seconded the motion and with a vote of 6 – 0 from the Planning Commission Members present, the document as presented was recommended to Council.)

Chairman Darby: Congratulations. Thank you to everyone that put in such conscientious work on this and it is a lot friendlier document.

VIII. Discussion

- A. Mrs. Harlow: Oak Hills, they were on the agenda another time but they were never discussed, is that correct?

Chairman Darby: That is correct. It is just a concept.

- B. Mr. Ramirez: Do we have an official swearing in of new Members?

Mrs. Harlow: Typically we do. I remember Mr. Knox swearing us in at one time but that has been a long time ago when I was on BZA; I remember him swearing in people on that. I don't know if that is something Mrs. McNear would do.

Mr. Thamann: I will ask Mrs. McNear.

Chairman Darby: We could schedule it for the first item at our next meeting before we conduct any kind of business. Is that acceptable?

Mr. Ramirez: Yes.

- C. Mrs. McBride: I have two things for the Commission. I wanted to let everybody know that on January 22nd, which is a Friday, we will be doing the Allure Planning and Zoning Workshop out in Anderson. It is something that is put on by the Cincinnati Section of the Ohio Planning Conference. If you are interested in going, there is a registration form that we can send out to you and we will get those back to Mr. Taylor. That is the all-day training session for Planning, Zoning, BZA Members and it is really a useful training opportunity. It does also include breakfast, lunch and a happy hour afterward. What's not to like?

The second thing is that we are going to be conducting our own training right here in the City of Springdale once again, don't miss that opportunity. The date has been yet to be set. We are going to do it on the Board of Zoning Appeals and the Planning Commission together and we will be polling you to find a date that will work. My partner, Gregg Dale and the Law Director, Jeff Forbes will be doing that. I will likely be there, as well. Hopefully it will be a good session as well.

Chairman Darby: As a past attendee, I highly recommend attendance at this conference. It is a fabulous day.

Mrs. Harlow: Yes.

Mrs. McBride: Obviously we are not going to do that during the holidays, so it will be something to look forward to in the winter.

IX. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Chairman Darby: There is nothing on the Chairman's Report this month.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Darby: We will accept a motion to adjourn.

(Mr. Hawkins moved to adjourn, Mrs. Harlow seconded, and the City of Springdale Planning Commission meeting concluded at 8:10 p.m.)

The next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for January 12th, 2016.

Respectfully submitted,

_____, 2015 _____
Don Darby, Chairman

_____, 2015 _____
Richard Bauer, Secretary