

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
December 11, 2018
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: Dave Okum, Richard Bauer, Lawrence Hawkins III, Meghan Sullivan-Wisecup, Tom Hall, Joe Ramirez, Don Darby

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

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

IV. MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF NOVEMBER 13, 2018

Chairman Darby: The chair will accept the motion to adopt the minutes of our previous meeting held on November 13th.

Mr. Hawkins: I move to adopt.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: Second.

Chairman Darby: It has been moved and seconded that the minutes of the previous meeting be adopted. By voice vote all those in favor, opposed, abstentions? Those minutes are adopted.

(Voice vote taken and the minutes were adopted with a vote of 7 to 0.)

V. REPORT ON COUNCIL

Chairman Darby: Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Hawkins: Thank you Mr. Chairman. City Council met on November 21, 2018. Six members were present. Council had before it Ordinance No. 53-2018, an Ordinance authorizing the City of Springdale, Ohio to enter into a master lease agreement and equipment schedule no. 004, by and between Huntington Public Capital Corporation and the City of Springdale, Ohio and an escrow agreement by and among Huntington National Bank, the City of Springdale and Huntington Public Capital Corporation to finance the purchase of a bucket truck for the City of Springdale and authorizing other documents in connection there with and declaring an emergency. That passed with six affirmative votes. We also had Resolution R17-2018 authorizing the City Administrator to use reward points from credit card accounts to provide gift cards to Springdale Offering Support, or S.O.S. in order to provide necessary assistance to area residents and that also passed with six affirmative votes. We then had some discussion with regard to the idea and whether or not to bring forth an Ordinance for putting on the ballot tax increase of .5%. So, it was discussed and felt that it was appropriate to go forward with in the future. Council also met on December the 5th. All seven members were present at that time. We had before us the introduction of a few new employees. Elizabeth Frazier in the Fitness Center Manager, Christina Ingle, Assistant to the City Administrator; Sandra Fohl in the Tax Department had received a new position as Tax Department Account Clerk No. 2. We had before us Ordinance No. 54-2018 to dissolve the special revenue fund known as the Vehicle Mobilization Fee Fund and to transfer the remaining balance of the General Fund and declaring an emergency. That passed with a 7-0 vote. The City no longer was mobilizing vehicles in that same way. Ordinance No. 55-2018 was also before us establishing a special revenue fund entitled The Court

Computerization Fund and declaring an emergency. That passed with a 7-0 vote. It is going to be an increase in court cost by \$10.00. So, Court cost now will be \$65.00 and the reality is, that additional \$10.00 will go into a fund that will allow us to buy computers that will have to be used for one year in the courts and then can be moved out to various other offices within the city. Ordinance No. 56-2018 authorizing the Mayor and Clerk of Council/Finance Director to amend the contract of CT Consultants, Inc. for the Engineering services to the City of Springdale and declaring an emergency. That passed with a 7-0 vote. That was an increase for them. We had Ordinance No. 57-2018 authorizing the Mayor and Clerk of Council/Finance Director to enter into an agreement with Strauss and Troy for legal services to the City of Springdale and declaring an emergency. The City had had Wood and Lamping representing us as our Law Director and with a 5-2 passage we now have Strauss and Troy representing us in legal matters. We had Resolution R18-2018 confirming the Mayor's reappointment of Rita Hart as a member of the Board of Health which passed with a 7-0 vote. Resolution R19-2018 confirming the Mayor's reappointment of Kevin Kettering as a member of the Board of Health and that also passed with a 7-0 vote. We had Resolution R20-2018, a resolution proposing an increase in income tax to 2% from 1.5% and directing that increase in income tax be submitted to the electors. That was a first reading. There will be a total of four readings before there will be a vote on that matter. That concludes my report unless there are any questions or Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup has anything to add.

Chairman Darby: Thank you very much.

VI. CORRESPONDENCE

VII. OLD BUSINESS

- A. Nelson Online, 11560 Princeton Pike, Springdale, Ohio, Revision to PUD / Lot Split (Application 34317)

Chairman Darby: Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: Thank you Mr. Chairman. You all saw this case last month and the applicant requested to come back this month. So, again this is nothing new for you. This is the old Ponderosa site. This is the site plan that you all looked at last time around and as you will recall the flow of the traffic through the drive thru was going to be kind of counter to the traffic that comes along the Skyline side here. So, that was the, I would say, the most significant issue that we were faced with. This was discussed as well, this is actually the site plan for the small hospital that is to the south of this site. I think, one of the more interesting things here, they had proposed a sidewalk that extended to the north property line and then this is the current site plan for the Bank of America and you will see that there is kind of a ramp here to take care of the grade change and then the sidewalk extends down to the Thompson Thrift property down along here. The real change here is that the traffic flow now, as you can see on your packet, basically it goes through here and the ATM's were moved to this location. The canopy that was on the back of the building for the drive thru was eliminated and the traffic flow will enter here, exit so that it is not in conflict with the primary movement of the traffic on the Skyline site. This is just kind of an enlargement that indicates what is going on here and again these are the two ATM kiosks. This is the landscape plan. They have relocated the dumpster enclosure which was another issue. They were previously trying to reuse the Ponderosa enclosure which was not in too good of shape so that situation has been rectified as well. These are the building elevations. Again, very similar to what you saw previously, the difference being that the canopy to the rear of the building has been removed. Then this is a depiction of the remote teller/ATM kiosks. There is two of these I believe that are going to be located on the property and in lieu of the canopy they have a little, I guess you would still call it a canopy. It is a weather protection thing for folks driving up here and using these terminals. That is about all that I have Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Darby: Mrs. McBride.

Mrs. McBride: Thank you. The property is contained within our PUD district which requires a total of 30% open space. Right now the existing Ponderosa site had a little over 14% but the proposed development will have over 32% so that is a significant increase not only in conformance with our code but also the appearance of the property. The bank building itself is 4,325 square feet. By our code it would require 14 parking spaces and they are in compliance with that they actually have 15 that meet the design requirements of our code. They are also required to have two bicycle racks and they are proposing three of those so that is in compliance. As Mr. Taylor indicated they did relocate those ATM kiosk locations to the northeast corner of the site. They are required to have four stacking spaces for those and they continue to meet that requirement. In terms of setbacks they meet all of our setback requirements with the exception of parking to the side yard to the south there to the proposed hospital. Ten feet is required and I think my scaling they had about six feet there. It is a PUD so Planning Commission can approve that modification. As Mr. Taylor indicated they were originally proposing to reuse that Ponderosa waste enclosure and staff was not in support of that, I think we showed you a lovely picture of that. So, they have come back and redone, they are proposing a new waste enclosure that does meet the requirements of our code including with gates and material to match the building. The only thing that we want to make sure is that it is in fact five feet off of the south property line which is required by our code. That was not dimensioned. They have provided signage this time around. Last time you remember that was something that was missing. They are indicating a ground mount sign on Princeton Pike that would be six feet tall and contain 28 square feet which is within the code. One sheet showed it on one side of the access drive, the other sheet showed it on the other side of the access drive so we need to make sure exactly where it is going to be and that it meets our setback requirements. We also are going to need to have them define the base material for that ground mount sign, it needs to be of a material that matches some of the building materials. The site itself, the building is entitled to signage only on the west elevation because that is the only side that has actually frontage on a public street and they are entitled to 93.5 square feet of sign area. They are proposing signage on the north, the west, and the south elevation that actually totals 97.54 square feet so it is a little bit over but staff believes that it is appropriate given the type use to have signage on the three sides of the building elevation for visibility and so forth and that the four-square feet of sign area over is also appropriate. It's not an overabundance of signage for the building. They are proposing directional signage as well, obviously to guide customers to kiosk locations. Those meet the height and the area requirements of the code. The only thing again is that we will need to make sure that they are 10 feet off the lot lines and five feet off of the public right of way because those were not dimensioned. Mr. Taylor showed you the building elevations. The building is going to be a mixture of stone and EFUS and wood siding. We suggested that the applicant bring building materials and color samples for the commission this evening. They have supplied and I think it was in your packets, details indicating that they will be screening the roof mounted equipment in compliance with our zoning code. We had a few minor clean up items on the landscape plan which staff can resolve with the applicant if that is the preference of the Planning Commission. They did submit a revised photometric plan. If you remember the photometric plan that they had in was way off of our charts so, they have revised that. The fixtures are now mounted at 24 feet which is permitted within this type of use. They meet the 2.5 foot-candles at the property line everywhere except one small portion which is adjacent to the commercial so staff is not concerned about that. They do have higher foot-candles than is permitted by the ATM kiosk and by the two entryways to the bank. We have worked with a number of financial institutions over the years and security obviously is a big concern for these types of users. They also have to consider their security cameras, if the light levels are too low you can't make out the difference between a gray car and a green car and so forth and so on. So, at any rate they have significantly toned down those light levels by the ATM and by the entrances. Again, they are still higher than our code permits but Planning Commission, since it is a PUD, can approve those modifications and staff would suggest that you do that. We feel that they are appropriate where they are. So, if you have any questions I would be happy to answer those.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Mr. Shvegza.

Mr. Shvezda: Thank you Mr. Chairman. The main access point for the development is of course from State Route 747. It was unclear from the plans whether the drive apron at 747 was going to be reconstructed or salvaged so that needs to be clarified. As Mr. Taylor had noted the direction of traffic into the ATM area has been changed such that it will now flow as it exits the site in the direction of the traffic that is within the Skyline property, however; in that area we do need some additional signage to reinforce that there is no left turns there. Regards to the storm water management, neither the Skyline nor the Ponderosa properties subject property have detention. In fact, the development is actually reducing the impervious area by 20%. As far as the storm sewer and catch basins themselves they are not now shown, however; there was no analysis to verify the capacity of the catch basins and storm sewer. In addition, the angles of the storm sewer that enter the catch basin within the Skyline drive may be problematic just in so far as there being enough room within the catch basin so the applicant will need to review that and make sure that's basically salvageable. Also, in addition the work on that storm sewer and catch basin that goes out into that Skyline drive needs to be coordinated obviously with the Skyline operations to make sure that their, in particular, their drive thru traffic isn't hindered. One other thing, it was reviewed on the original Thompson Thrift plan that there is a storm sewer catch basin that is just at the northern end of this subject's site. It noted that it has not located the actual storm sewer that the location was unknown so just as a comment to the applicant just to verify that that is in place before they utilize it for their own storm sewer system. Regarding the post construction best management practices, understand that there has been a 20% reduction in impervious area but we would recommend that at least the minimal type of post construction BMP be utilized on this site and this could be catch basin sediment traps which are relatively simple and quite a bit less expensive than your hydrodynamic separators. Last item is of course I think Mr. Taylor mentioned that the, as far as the subject plan that has been submitted that does now include a sidewalk connection via ramps to the proposed sidewalk that would be part of the small hospital site. That concludes my comments.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Would the applicant care to come forward? Good evening.

Mr. Garnett: Good evening. Thank you for having us come revisit and allow us to make the corrections that you had requested in the last meeting. Again, my name is Brandon Garnett with Nelson Architecture. With me we actually have Kelly Stedman with Civil Engineering as well as representatives from the owner as well as the landlord, both. Going over the biggest item, as Mr. Taylor had spoken to was traffic flow concern coming off the back of the property. Originally, we were having the drive thru canopy connect to the back side of the building so it was a canopy structure connected to the building. Since then we understood the stacking requirement and we tried and attempted to move the drive thru canopy to the other side of the building but it would not allow us to comply with stacking. So, that was the reason why we went to the remote units that you folks see. Those are just a premanufactured unit that the Bank of America supplies. It is all one built in unit that has its own power supply, own lighting, all that fun stuff. That was the renderings that you folks saw just a few moments ago. That allows us to fix the traffic flow concern and actually increased our green space a little bit because of the island or so to speak the island that is in the middle has enlarged it a little bit. A few of the items to discuss that I just wanted to follow up on. One was in regards to the trash enclosure. What we were proposing was, and I apologize for the confusion if there was any, was utilizing the existing structure of the trash enclosure and of course adding gates to it that comply with local code as well as recladding it to match the building materials. It was a stone veneer that we have on our highest stone arch of our facility and that would be the same stone that we would clad the unit with. I'm definitely open to suggestions in regards to that and we could see about possibly addressing the setback concern as well. But, that was, we were just proposing to utilize the existing structure is what we had there. In regards to the property line along the south, that was an existing curb that we had there. The reason why we did not move it too far north was, we just wanted to maintain the existing curb and curb cut and also to answer your follow up question, yes we do propose replacing that but just in its existing fashion but just like new. In regards to the photo metrics, we worked to comply

as noted the bank has, and other financial facilities we are all the same just like them we do have some security standards that the bank likes us to look out for just at the employee entrances and at the ATM's which kind of acted on some peculiar situations. Along the south piece of the property there was a light pole on the adjacent property that was kicking up our lighting levels a little bit and we are trying to monitor that and try to revise that as best we could but it was still kicking those, I think that was the concern was that one over there. It was kind of in the center. In regards to landscaping revisions, there are a few more comments in regards to that, that is definitely something that we would definitely revise and bring up to code. Other than that I think the biggest point of contention was the traffic flow in the drive thru lanes was the biggest point of contention.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. I am impressed with your responses with our initial comments from the last meeting. At this time we will open up for questions or comments from the commission. Mr. Bauer.

Mr. Bauer: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just a couple follow up questions. On the trash container, there was one of your exhibits in this packet, here,

Mr. Garnett: Oh, okay from the signage company.

Mr. Bauer: It shows the dumpster location kind of cocked at an angle verses your other plans show it. I mean basically it is the same location just a different orientation. Is your plan to keep it as the orientation is now?

Mr. Garnett: Yes, keep it as the orientation is now, leave it existing. We felt the structure of the trash enclosure was useful, we could reuse it, we could just reclad it and also add gates because the gates are

Mr. Bauer: Not useable. Okay. The other question was on the, I appreciate the change of the traffic flow around to the ATMs and the like. Visually what is depicted there with the cars, the, I'm going to call it the inner lane, makes the sharper turn. Do you feel that that and Mr. Shvezda, do you feel that is enough room to make that turn? It looks like it is a tight turn there that you might be on the curb. Just curious about the way that it's, you really can't tell on that drawing it's pretty small but the one that I am looking at it looks like that car could be in the curb.

Ms. Stedman: Right, we run auto turn on all of our

Chairman Darby: Excuse me could you identify yourself please.

Ms. Stedman: My name is Kelly Stedman, I am with Woolpert Engineering, I'm the Civil Engineer on the project.

Chairman Darby: Thank you.

Ms. Stedman: We've run auto turn on all of the turning radiuses for the cars, easy fix is just opening up that radius slightly to prevent you know chipping of the curb so that will help that.

Mr. Bauer: Yeah. Okay. That was it, thank you.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Hawkins: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just going back to the dumpster enclosure. I just want to confirm, you are saying that you are going to put stone around the entire enclosure?

Mr. Garnett: Yes. It is actually

Mr. Hawkins: That bottom?

Mr. Garnett: That bottom left, or the bottom right from your perspective. That is actually the same stone that is going to be, there is a very high arch along the front façade of our building, it is the same exact stone, we are going to match with some of the building materials. Originally, we were looking at the wood material that we have but we noticed in the code that only stone, it did not say anything about wood so we chose the stone instead, yes.

Chairman Darby: Since you brought it in would you kind of walk us through your sample.

Mr. Garnett: Yes. Yes. So, with this these are the four building materials that we propose. The two main ones along the front façade, and this is an example depiction of a rendering that we have here. Almost all of our facilities along the front façade you will have a wood veneer along here, this is actually a product made by Trespa which allows us to put it into a bend to curve it to replicate that. We do have other financial centers that have just been completed and it did turn out very nicely and worked very well. So, that is most of the lower canopy along the whole front entrance where all of the store front is at. The higher, higher arch that you folks see that is the pinnacle stone here as depicted up along here along this arch. That is the only area on the building that you will see this stone is what we have proposed. Then also to kind of blend that together that was what we were proposing for the trash enclosure as well. To kind of give the building on the back side of it, it would be on the ATM side elevation, I believe it is the east elevation to give the building a little flavor so to speak. We were proposing another corner of the Trespa, the wood paneling, as you see right there on the right hand corner just too kind of offset all of the stucco the parick stucco along the back façade which will, and these are the true color representations of that material as well. So, it's a very earth tone kind of modern kind of colors and it is a new design actually. The banks only been using it for about a year to a year and a half so it is a brand new design for them. In the other areas where you see just the eyebrow canopy along giving patrons are going to walk into, customers that are going to walk into the facility there's an eyebrow canopy that comes along here. That is just going to be either aluminum or usually it is ACM paneling is what it is. So, those are the building materials.

Mr. Hawkins: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Darby: Okay thank you. Mr. Okum.

Mr. Okum: Thank you Mr. Chairman. The ATMs will be like a clad painted unit then?

Mr. Garnett: Yes, the whole unit is ACM paneling. Yes the whole unit is.

Mr. Okum: What percentage of it is red?

Mr. Garnett: That is actually an actual representation, that is exactly how we propose it so the border, the edging would be just red. So the sides would be red and then it would just be the perimeter on the front and back sides of it would be red.

Mr. Okum: From the street would you see any of those ATMs? Or drive thru?

Mr. Garnett: A little bit from Princeton Pike. I believe that they will be sitting outside.

(Someone talking off mic. not audible)

Mr. Garnett: I'm sorry. Yeah, you won't see them too well. If you're, yeah the building is going to be blocking them from Princeton Pike.

Mr. Okum: Okay.

Mr. Garnett: They do have also kind of a ghosted so to speak, the Bank of America logo, it's that flag scape that looks like a big flag. That is kind of ghosted into the red as well. It is very very subtle. You have to get within ten feet of the structure to be able to actually see it but from a distance it just looks like just a red panel.

Mr. Okum: No more lights. I think I got it all. I'm ready.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Okum.

Mr. Okum: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move to approve the following project, Bank of America, 11560 Princeton Pike, case number 34317 per the specifications and designs provided in our meeting packet as exhibits which were submitted by the applicant and reviewed by staff prior to this meeting. This excludes submissions and comments to staff's review by the applicant unless specifically addressed by staff in their report. Changes to any of the following conditions referenced shall constitute a change in the required to be approved by this Planning Commission. This motion includes staff, City Engineer's, City Planner's recommendations contained in their report. Along with that all four building elevations shall have and exterior finish based upon the color pallet and samples provided this evening.

Mr. Hall: Mr. Chairman I'd like to second the motion.

Chairman Darby: It has been moved and seconded that this submittal be approved as identified in the motion. Secretary please call roll.

(Secretary called roll and the motion was approved with a vote of 7 to 0.)

Chairman Darby: Congratulations.

Mr. Garnett: Wonderful. Thank you so much for your time.

Chairman Darby: Welcome to Springdale.

Mr. Garnett: Thank you.

Chairman Darby: Do you have any toasters? No that was the 60's. I'm sorry.

Mr. Okum: What was that plates that they used to give us?

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

- A. SCP Springdale, 12110 Princeton Pike, Springdale, Ohio, Final Development Plan, Roadway Plans (Application 34472)

Chairman Darby: Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: Thank you Mr. Chairman. This case is also one that you are intimately familiar with. Of course this is the aerial showing the site. This is the approved preliminary plan and as you, I'm sure, recall you have seen and approved the mass excavation plan and the final development plan for buildings 2 and 3. This piece, hence its called package 3 it is still phase 1, package 3 and it is for the public improvements. We included, in your packet, I think just the cover sheet and this particular drawing. There is like 76 sheets in the set so we thought maybe you could do without the other 74 sheets. I think Mr. Shvegza has a number of detailed comments which he will go over with you and that concludes my report.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Shvegza.

Mr. Shvegza: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just to kind of highlight, that was a detailed set of plans that was presented, a lot of information. A lot of these comments that you see before you are detailed in nature more of staff level kind of discussion so I am just going to go through some to highlight a few of the aspects of the comments. One is regards to the truck turning analysis it utilized the larger truck and it did show, in particularly looking at the right in and right out island area there toward 747 that there would be essentially trucks would be able to turn through there but kind of much like

we had the issue with the buildings and the driveways, there's a couple of points where there is zero extra room basically for the trucks. So, we will kind of want to implement that same kind of criteria we had for the driveways and on those places where there is currently shown no additional room that we add an additional five feet to have a little bit of extra room for safety factor basically. In regards to the Crescentville Road plans. Again, the Butler County Engineer's office had reviewed the 60% complete set. It looks like all of the aspects of their comments have been addressed but however; obviously we will need Butler County to review it and buy into the final plans that you see before you now. In regards to the maintenance of traffic, a lot more information was presented in regards to how to maintain the traffic for The Crossings at the Park development. Some of the additional features that we would like to see added to it are some additional pavement markings across the parking lot area where it is going to be maintained across. Obviously there is going to be a lot of activity in the area so we need to have that to delineate where the actual drive location is at. Then some additional signage posted to direct people out and of course they will have to go in a particular direction during the construction and different phases but to have that signage right as they go north and either go to the left to get to 747 or through the latter part of the construction to go right. In addition the same kind of signage on Crescentville Road just to let them know at some point where the entrance is going to be strictly on Crescentville Road and there won't be any option to take 747 to the site. Again, as far as the right in and right out raised traffic island, we looked through this with the Public Works department and the consideration was that they could extend that. It is going to come around that the trucks will begin to be parallel to 747. They will look at approaching traffic through the rear view mirrors but an additional 50 foot would ensure that they are aligned up to be able to do that. In addition, because you are going to have quite a bit of concrete, especially at the 747 island at that location, to provide an aesthetic element to the entrance to do a stamped and colored concrete across that horizontal surface. Kind of showed an example what that could look like, it is one of many different pattern and colors that could be used but that was just shown what it would look like what it could look like. On the internal roadways, just a few minor comments in regards to, again as far as some of the driveway aprons are shown on the roadway plans and obviously they were shown on the building plans but again to transfer some of the information that we had asked for on the buildings as far as the widths of the drive aprons and make sure that is on both depending on to ensure that the information is there not knowing who exactly is going to construct that. In the area of the roadway that is adjacent to the retention basin, because of the 3 to 1 slope in the area and the depth of the permanent body of water and the retention basin guard rail is going to have to be placed in that location. As we have mentioned with building 3, the driveway to the north of the building there they have reversed the apron there to better deal with the profile of the driveway, therefore; we need a catch basin to the north of that northern driveway to make sure that we don't have water spilling over the depressed curb down into the site. That is a duplicate of the comment that we have for building 3. There was a concern on the cul-de-sac that the drive entrance in The Crossings at the Park is relatively close to what would be the drive entrance to the future development that is the NES commercial property that is more towards 747. So, our recommendation would be that that curb cut not be placed at this point. The one to the adjacent property to the west just because there is nothing really formulated on the books that really dictates what that driveway apron where the location would be so we would rather see that plan be developed and know exactly how it is going to be constructed or should be constructed to the cul-de-sac. As far as traffic control, as far as the stripping on the internal roadways, the addition of the two-way left turn lane and the proposed turn lane except for the cul-de-sac. Break away sign bases be utilized for replacements of signs on the medians and the islands along with surface raised pavement markers, interior markers on the raised medians and the island area at 747. As far as the traffic signal, again it appears that most of the changes have been made and the City Traffic Engineer is competing their review. Also, he wanted me to mention to that regards to the signal, once it is constructed the signal can be built and placed into flash operation just as a reminder the developer will be required to provide the city with traffic count showing that the traffic at what point traffic sufficiently meets one of the required signal warrants for the full operation to be basically to allow the signal to be put into operation. Up until that time it would basically remain on flash. We will have to generate enough traffic in there to warrant the operation of the signal. Also,

the addition of a pedestrian crossing on the east leg of the intersection across Crescentville Road should be added. There are some items in landscaping and a lot of those pertain to specific issues but the one thing that we have not seen yet is the lighting plan for the street so that will, by itself, affect the street tree placements because we don't want those in areas where they will hinder the illumination from street lights so although we are commenting on the landscape plan in regards to the street trees there is going to be another iteration of how to change that to work with the street lights. Then we do have the same comments that we have for building 3 in regards to the, as you pull out of the driveway there is a line of street trees, those need to be adjusted so that we have a good site distance to the left. There is the tree placements behind, outside the right of way that happens to be within what is noted on the plans as a public utility easement and we are very much guessing that the utilities would not permit the placement of the trees within their easement. The last item was just in regards to the gateway element there at what would be the southeast corner of 747 and Crescentville. That's not yet represented and that would be one of the elements that we would look to tie into with the concrete pattern and color that would be proposed for the island area there at State Route 747. That concludes my comments.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Mrs. McBride, did anything come up that you want to share with us?

Mrs. McBride: Nope, nothing, thank you.

Chairman Darby: I know it is painful for you. For the commission members, I would like to bring something up. If you recall, going way back into the past, one of the things that we did talk about with this development was the gateway monument. Does the Administration have any update that they can give us as far as what the City's thought on this are?

Mrs. McBride: We actually have been asked to, Mr. Shvezgda has forwarded us the area which has been dedicated for the gateway element and we are working on some conceptual plans to present to the City Administration for what would happen in that area. Right now we are thinking of the incorporation obviously of a Welcome to Springdale sign as well as some kind of electronic message center that could include, tree lighting Monday night at 7 o'clock or whatever it is. Obviously, there would be landscaping and so forth around there.

Chairman Darby: Applicant please come forward.

Mr. Wright: Good evening, David Wright with the Kleingers Group. With me tonight I've got John Cumming with Strategic Capital. We appreciate you having us here tonight. Mainly this is, I was talking to Don earlier, this is kind of a technical submittal for the roadway set of plans. Just so you understand, we have made the submittal set, what we are considering or have been considering kind of a finalized for review set for the road knowing that we still need to coordinate the final kind of design with Duke Energy and Cincinnati Bell and those are kind of layers that come on once we have the roadway set. We actually have a meeting on Thursday with Duke Energy to finalize gas and electric so those things like street lights will be getting coordinated and placed onto the plans for Mr. Shvezgda and Mrs. McBride to review here within the next couple of weeks. Certainly we are here for any questions or comments that you may have and thank you again for everybody's time.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: I just wanted to mention when buildings 2 and 3 were here last month, you all asked for kind of a final final plan if you will because there was some detail information that was sort of lacking and they are on board with that. I'm just putting that out there for the record.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Mr. Okum.

Mr. Okum: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just a couple of items. Don, you mentioned the signal at Crescentville Road and Transportation Way and I guess it is now Springdale Commerce Park Way? Got a name. So anyway. It's fine I don't care. Doesn't really matter. That's really hard to get into the minutes. I had a question in regards to the signal being green. I heard your comments in regards to flashing yellow during construction or after it is put in place but one of the things that is really annoying and I don't know if it is going to be here or not, is a signal that turns red when there is no cars around on Transportation Way or Springdale Commerce Park to trip it. If there is nothing there, we would hope that Crescentville Road would have a continuous green instead of stopping traffic. Can that be done? So I am saying demand on Transportation Way.

Mr. Shvegza: I'm trying to recall. There will be detection on the side streets so I am sure that that will be part of what is in place for the operation of the signal then. It will primarily run for Crescentville Road and only come up as the side street traffic is there at the signal.

Mr. Okum: Okay.

Mr. Shvegza: Of course we will work with the City Traffic Engineer to develop or refine the phasing for the signal to make it operate in conjunction with, obviously the next signal to the west which is 747/Crescentville Road signal there.

Mr. Okum: It just really gets annoying when you go to intersections and you are sitting there for two minutes for a signal to go through a cycle and there is no car going either way and you are saying why am I here? In particular is there going to be a right turn lane on the parkway going east on Crescentville?

Mr. Shvegza: As I recall there is a double left and is it a through and right? I can't remember now.

Mr. Wright: I'm sorry I can't recall.

Mr. Okum: It's just how that impacts because a lot of people will pull up, stop and go on a right turn only. I understand the reason for the double left because of the business traffic that we are really trying to funnel them to 747. If we could just look at those items when we do it. This came to mind, a couple of items came to mind when we were dealing with the new residential subdivision that recently came to Springdale and that is a mail center. Is there going to be a mail center for the development or is there going to be individual, do the carriers go to the individual buildings?

Mr. Cumming: As far as I know they will go to the individual buildings. I don't know if that has been fully vetted.

Mr. Okum: If there is going to be a situation where a mail center is required there needs to be an allocation of some place for someone to pull over safely and get out of their vehicle to be able to do that. So, if that could be looked into for the purposes of safety for the driver getting out of the car and going over to the mail center. The other item I had that I did not bring up at the last meeting, I just wanted to get your perspective on and it has not been an issue, are you setting a work practice hours for the excavation and the moving of earth for the development? I mean are we

Mr. Cumming: I will confirm what those are with Hemmer the general contractor.

Mr. Okum: Yeah, typically so we don't end up with a nuisance and complaints from the neighbors, we probably do want to set some standards that, for the contractor, that are reasonable so the contractor can get his work done but on the other hand at five in the morning they are not running excavation equipment next to the homes of Heritage Hill and next to the condos.

Mr. Cumming: That makes sense.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
11 DECEMBER 2018

PAGE 11

Mr. Okum: If we could do that that would be great.

Mr. Cumming: Okay.

Mr. Okum: That is all I have Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: The City does have a noise ordinance regarding, well excessive noise at odd ball times and so forth but if they can give us something that would be a little easier to regulate from a time stand point rather than have to rely on the noise ordinance that would be wonderful.

Mr. Okum: That's what I am asking for. You don't have any problem with that do you?

Mr. Cumming: We do not.

Mr. Okum: That's all I have Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Darby: I don't have any lights here.

Mr. Okum: For purposes of discussion there is really no reason to put those two items into the motion but the applicant has indicated that they would do that. Based up on that, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move to approve Springdale, SCP Springdale LLC, southeast corner of State Route 747 and Crescentville Road, case no. 34472 per the specifications and designs provided in our meeting packet as exhibits which were submitted by the applicant and reviewed by staff prior to this meeting. This motion includes the following conditions: the staff, City Engineer's recommendations and considerations contained in their report.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: I second.

Chairman Darby: It has been moved and seconded that this submittal be approved as identified in the motion. Secretary please call the roll.

(Secretary called the roll and the motion was approved with a vote of 7-0.)

Chairman Darby: Getting closer and closer.

Mr. Cumming: Thank you.

Chairman Darby: Thank you for coming.

B. Maple Knoll, 11100 Springfield Pike, Springdale, Ohio, Development Plan (Application 34473)

Chairman Darby: Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: Thank you Mr. Chairman. This is an aerial of the site. You all probably recall seeing this because this was recently rezoned from residential single household low density to PF. This is the Manor House up here and the project basically is going to be in this area here. Part of this parking lot and part of this undeveloped ground down here. This is the site plan that is proposed. We have met the applicant and discussed some issues that we had kind of on an earlier submission on our preliminary which they have taken care of. Primarily it had to do with widening this access right along through here. One issue that is still kind of under development, there is a significant amount of vegetation down on this particular portion of the site. They are working with us to try to determine an actual tree survey. So, prior to anything that actually gets, let's say any kind of building permits or anything there will be the Tree Preservation ordinance will have to be fully investigated. This is, they call it supplemental landscape plan, it shows some additional planting, basically the foundation plantings around the building which

typically we would not regulate. Then this is a rendering of the actual building construction. There are 14 units on the site. One other issue of note here, the distance between these two buildings is shown at 15 feet. Our code requires a 20 foot separation between the buildings. It was discussed with the applicant whether this row of eight units could be reduced a few inches per unit in order to make that 60 inches up. All of these units are intended to be at least adaptable and by that I mean could be made to be fully accessible for people that have some disability. Because of that it is very difficult, the applicant has indicated, to reduce the size of these because there is a number of requirements for doorway widths, circulation within the unit for a wheelchair bound person. That's really all I have at this point. Thank you.

Chairman Darby: Mrs. McBride.

Mrs. McBride: Thank you. As Mr. Taylor indicated they are in for development plan review of the 14 units. The zoning was approved this past summer, June, by City Council to Public Facilities District. Each of the 14 units is going to contain approximately 1,700 square feet. They would have two bedrooms, two bathrooms, a single car garage as well as a rear private patio. The 14 units would actually require, by our code, 28 parking spaces. So, they have the one in the garage and then a second one on the driveway itself which complies with the design requirements of our code. They are proposing to eliminate roughly 30 parking spaces that are currently adjacent and serve the Manor House restaurant. Per our code, parking is required for the Manor House at one space per 200 square feet. They are going to be adding 15 parking spaces back into this area but we are going to need to make sure that the Manor House's whole parking wise in terms of we don't know how big it is so how many parking spaces is required and then how many parking spaces are provided within the development so that Manor House is not left short of parking. The proposed density is 4.6 units to the acre which is below the 8 units that is permitted in the PF district. As Mr. Taylor indicated, the one item, BZA item, is that the two buildings there on the southern part of the site are actually 15 feet apart where our code requires 20 feet. Those are units 804 and 805 on Maple Wood Lane. That would require approval of a variance by the Board of Zoning Appeals from the 20 foot to the 15 foot proposed setback. Our staff report mistakenly identifies a second variance that is not required. They actually are meeting the minimum of 50% open space, it should have been impervious surface, at any rate, so they do not need a variance for that. The photometric lighting plan is consistent with the requirements of our code. They are using a bell shaped sort of metal fixture mounted at 15 feet in height and they meet all of the light level requirements both at the property line and internally within the development. The height of the proposed buildings is below the 35 feet that is permitted within the PF district. We had a few minor comments on the landscape plan that we can work out with the applicant and then we have also suggested that they bring building material and color samples for the Planning Commission to review this evening.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Mr. Shvezda.

Mr. Shvezda: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just as a reminder, when this was before Planning Commission for the rezoning, a trip generation summary was submitted and it was well under the 100 trip generation threshold that would have required additional traffic study information be submitted. In regards to storm water management, the applicant is proposing utilizing underground detention system such as the ADS Stormtech System and I just kind of included a photo of what that looks like there. One underground system is located at the south east corner of the development and its outlet point is to a storm sewer system that is within Cole Avenue which is located within Glendale. Back in 1996 or so when the parking lot was submitted for review it was determined that there was a limited capacity in the storm sewer that is within Cole Avenue in the Village of Glendale, so we work with the Village and determined that there was a specific allowable rate that could be discharged from the subject site. That information has been given to the applicant and they've worked to revise the analysis to determine what the actual detention volume would be. Basically, the applicant is proposing 7,549 cubic feet of volume for the detention and contingent upon the supporting documentation, we are acceptable to that particular detention volume amounts. The other underground system is located at the south west corner of the

subject site and its outlet goes into the existing storm sewer system that is within the Maple Knoll Village site and then it actually goes into detention on the Maple Knoll Village site and discharges into Washington Avenue which is again within the Village of Glendale. The applicate is proposing 5,897 cubic feet of volume for the detention and again contingent on the submission of the detailed analysis for that are acceptable. Again, in regards to the post construction BMP's the applicant is providing a couple of methods here, its actually providing water quality volume within the detention basin areas for the applicant's proposing 2,354 cubic feet of volume for the water quality at the south east corner and 2,687 cubic feet of volume for the water quality at the south west corner. In addition they are also providing hydro dynamic separators up-stream from each underground detention system. Again, with the post construction BMP's the operation and maintenance agreement will need to be completed and recorded for the development. In addition there is at the north end between the very northern unit and the adjacent ground there is a proposed modular retaining wall. It just around four feet in height and actually it is only viewable from the residents, not from the area to the north. The applicant has submitted a specific type of modular wall and color and I did not know if they brought the physical representation of those but that's what we will need to see also. That concludes my comments.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Applicants please come forward. Good evening.

Mr. Dooley: Good evening. My name is Mike Dooley with Bayer Becker, 1404 Race Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. With us this evening we have the architect, Luminaut and the owner from Maple Knoll Village. Just to address a couple of comments that we have been working very closely with Mrs. McBride and Mr. Taylor on with regard to the site. We understand that the variance is going to be required between the two buildings. The requirement is 20 feet and we are proposing 15 feet. As Mr. Taylor said, we have a program that works really good for the units that allows for accessibility within the units and a little bit of flexibility and we would like to hold that. So, when you look at the existing building to the west, and then also our proposed building to the east we just think that that 15 feet reduction works better for our site internal there. We considered lumping all of the buildings together but we'd like to just like to have that little break in the buildings for aesthetics. So, we will, assuming that we get approval tonight, we will plan to come back in for a variance on that 15 foot setback. With regard to the landscaping, we are working on the requirements for the landscaping, a couple of internal comments. We are aware of the tree preservation relocation requirement so we're working to, we do have a survey of all the trees on site. We understand which trees that we are removing that would require replacement. So, we've got numbers that we can come back and work with Mr. Taylor on prior to submitting for building permit. So, we will either replace those trees on site are replaced then some were maybe on campus, or contribute to the fund. So we will review that with the owner and make sure that we comply with all of those requirements. With regard to the Manor House parking, the existing parking lot is kind of an overflow parking lot but it did serve a Manor House. We just did an analysis of the existing campus and there are about 81 visitor parking spaces within a radius of about 750 feet of the Manor House. With the square footage of the existing Manor House is about 10,000 square feet so at one space for 200 square feet where looking at about 52 guest parking stalls. So, we feel like with the existing visitor spaces that are on campus, which is the 81 compared to the 50 that are required for the Manor House, we feel that there is adequate parking to serve the Manor House even with this existing parking going away. On top of that Maple Knoll has shuttle services and valet services that will go to the Manor House that we can talk about in for the detail if we want to.

Mr. Hahn: My name is Jeremiah Hahn with Luminaut. Just to reiterate kind of what Mike was saying, for special events or any additional hosting that the Manor House is going to reach out for large groups are anything like that, they will provide the complimentary shuttle service as well as and/or the valet offering. So, I did want a touch base on that and talking about item number two which Mr. Taylor also made reference to. The variance, the 15 feet. So we did look at each of the units and we were trying to design these with flexibility for additional mobility features. So we don't want a resident down the road to be forced out of the unit so in place the

additional accessible opportunity for those folks to stay in their units for as long as possible is part of that goal.

Chairman Darby: When you speak of, and I'm speaking for myself, when you speak of Manor House, you are speaking about one of the gems here in Springdale. So, you're giving us assurance that your plan for parking is going to be workable for the Manor House?

Mr. Hahn: The current offering of the Manor House with special events, they do offer the complimentary shuttle service. I cannot guarantee that there may be, there is currently no event or any standard service that they provide for dinners or that. They do not run short of parking. So, with that said, during the special events that is where they run into any of those, they run into the challenges with the parking. So in those cases with a special events, that is where they will be providing the shuttle.

Chairman Darby: you mentioned the alternative spaces and they are located what 750 feet.

Mr. Hahn: yeah.

Chairman Darby: will they be identifiable for patrons?

Mr. Hahn: that we can, so we are required 52 per the zoning code 18 of which are right out in front, we will be providing an additional 11 and in turn 15 adjacent with the new development. What Maple Knoll does do is they provide directional signage. Typically during special events where those parking spaces may be found and we can work with Maple Knoll and come up with some sort of plan to better identify if that is truly an issue with the way finding throughout the campus.

Chairman Darby: Personally, I would think it is but I am speaking for myself.

Mr. Okum: I think we are all, anyone of use that have gone there say the parking for Manor House is a problem, an issue especially for us that want to go there and visit with family. The shuttle works great for the residents but it doesn't work great for people that want to go visit family or go there to the restaurant and visit family. So, basically you don't parking. It is, to go around the back of the building and then from this parking area it is really inconvenient for most people that are used to going to Manor House. So, we are not encouraging over development with asphalt but in this particular case, since we are taking some parking area away from Manor House we really need to look at alternatives for Manor House so that guests of the residents and other people that do go to Manor House, and you are looking at people that have and that is the number one reason why it is difficult to go there.

Mr. Hahn: Okay. We will revisit this with Maple Knoll and express your concerns. I think that there is a way that we can absolutely come up with some sort of way finding or some sort of plan to accommodate where the parking spots are.

Chairman Darby: We would appreciate that.

Mr. Okum: That would be very helpful.

Chairman Darby: Any other questions folks?

Mr. Dooley: One last thing if I may? From the site perspective I do have, the question was brought up about the retaining wall in the north corner. I've got a, just a cut sheet with a color sample if you would like to see that?

Mr. Okum: Yes we would.

Mr. Dooley: Just to note as well, the wall, it's high on the north side and low on the south side so it will be really only visible to our proposed buildings not to the one to the north. You can pass this around if that is okay. This just shows the type of wall

that we are proposing. It is a standard Allan Block wall and then the color is the one highlighted in the middle, it is the greyer one.

Chairman Darby: That is referenced in the reporting right?

Mr. Dooley: It is the spec that is called out in the report, yeah. This is just a spec.

Chairman Darby: Right. Mr. Ramirez.

Mr. Ramirez: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I see that you only have one car garage and with the 1,700 square foot cottage, and currently if you have one garage and one car is going to park behind that where are visitors going to park?

Mr. Dooley: So there are an additional 11 spaces that are to the north, the northern entrance of the development so that is some additional parking as well in addition.

Mr. Ramirez: So is there any parking on the street in front of the

Mr. Dooley: No there is no proposed parking on the streets.

Mr. Ramirez: So, I'm guessing that a lot of these older folks will be challenged at walking a distance or in a wheel chair.

Mr. Dooley: Well there is one additional parking/guest parking spot in each of the driveways. So we have a one parking within the garage and then a guest parking in the driveway as well.

Mr. Ramirez: This is for the other members. I don't remember in the recent history of having a one car garage in a facility that is at least 1,700 square feet. Is that the case?

Chairman Darby: Do we have any history there? Mr. Okum.

Mr. Okum: I was, I had it on my list of questions because I was not sure if, in the PF district it requires a two car garage. So, I didn't get my code book out, we need to get out that chart and look at it and see.

Mr. Dooley: Can I address that?

Mr. Okum: Sure.

Mr. Dooley: So, Anne I think we said that the 14 units requires 28 spaces, so we were saying that the one car garage takes care of the one and the driveway spot would take care of the other?

Mr. Okum: I understand, it's just, I am not sure if the code specifically say that we have to have a two car garage. Because, when we updated the code a year and a half, two years ago, I thought that all residential units required a two car garage. So, we probably need to make sure.

Mr. Taylor: Single family.

Mr. Okum: Single family.

Mr. Taylor: Yes.

Mr. Okum: Multi-family doesn't, these are not single so these would be, these fall under multi-family use in a PF district?

Mr. Taylor: Correct. I think the other part of this is these are senior units and I think the expectation is, and possibly Maple Knoll could address this, is that I think that the predominance of folks who live there probably do not have two cars. That is not to say that people can't have two cars, I just don't believe that most folks do.

Chairman Darby: Mrs. McBride.

Mrs. McBride: Thank you. What staff used when looking at the parking calculations for this development was the multi-household dwelling. That requires 1 ½ spaces for one bedroom units and then 2 spaces for two bedroom units. So, that was the calculation that we use for coming up with the 28 spaces.

Mr. Ramirez: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Okum.

Mr. Okum: If I may Mr. Chairman. For purposes of a motion I hereby move to approve the following project: Coventry Court Villas at Maple Knoll, case no. 34473, per specifications and designs provided in our meeting packet as exhibits which were submitted by the applicant and reviewed by staff prior to this meeting. This excludes submissions and comments to staff's review by applicant unless specifically address by the staff in their report. Changes to any of the following conditions referenced shall constitute a change in the approved plan. Such changes shall require approval by the Planning Commission. This motion also includes staff, City Engineer's and City Planner's recommendations and considerations contained in their report. This approval is also conditional upon approval by the Springdale Board of Zoning Appeals for the identified variance for a 15 foot space between the buildings in lieu of a 20 foot requirement. The tree preservation requirements conditions shall be reviewed and approved by staff. All four building elevations and exterior color pallets shall be per the samples provided by the applicant.

Mr. Ramirez: I second.

Chairman Darby: It has been moved and seconded that this application be approved as identified in the motion. Secretary please call the roll.

(Secretary called the roll and the motion was approved with a vote of 7-0.)

Chairman Darby: And we are sure that those creative juices will be at work for the parking situation.

Mr. Dooley: Yes sir. Thank you for your time.

Chairman Darby: Thank you for coming. Everybody okay?

- C. Ditsch/Pretzel Baron, 311 Northland Boulevard, Springdale, Ohio, Revision to Development Plan (Application 34475)

Chairman Darby: Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: Thank you Mr. Chairman. This is a view of the existing facility. It is zoned SS. Again this is a project that you all are somewhat familiar with. This came before you all last August. This was their preliminary development plan. I apologize because of a couple of things here. One, the drawings are not oriented in the same manor and I really couldn't do too much about that and the other thing is quite frankly staff was somewhat confused by the initial application by the applicant and at Mr. Darby's suggestion we contacted the applicant and we received some clarification which I am sure they will be willing to go over with you folks here shortly. The issues here are, this was the, again this is what you all approved and there were two silos here enclosed by this particular building element here and this is the current proposal which again, I'm sorry it is oriented in the opposite direction. Northland Boulevard is up here and the current proposal actually calls for three silos and an oil storage tank, all of which would be enclosed in a very similar enclosure, however; instead of being that kind of tan color, they are now proposing the enclosure to be this red color that basically mimics the building and if you kind of look at the renderings that they provided you will see that

sort of red element there. You'll note, I think, in the comments that we were a little confused because there's kind of a screen wall shown here. We didn't really quite get the drift of that and the unloading area was moved here which took up some parking spaces. Originally, the idea was that the flour truck would back up right directly to the silos, it would off load into the silos and pull out and move away. What was shared with us on Friday and is not reflected in your report is that the wall was kind of a misunderstanding on the part of the applicant. They thought that we wanted the unloading area to be screened and really that wasn't the case because on this approved plan there was some landscaping. This drawing does not 100% reflect, this is the drawing that was presented but staff had some comments regarding additional landscaping and your approval was based on the inclusion of staff's comments. So, the idea would be that they would go back to the idea of landscape screening in this area here all along the front of the building. That wall that was referred to in the latest submission would not be constructed and the loading and unloading zone would go back to the original location which is basically here which kind of eliminates the parking concern because this area was going to reduce the number of parking spaces below what code required. So, the long and the short of it is, after it is all said and done, the actual request here is to have three silos and one oil storage tank that would be enclosed similar to what was previously approved. It's a slightly larger enclosure and the color would change from that kind of tan color to this red brick color. I think that pretty well summarizes everything.

Chairman Darby: Thank you. Mrs. McBride.

Mrs. McBride: Thank you. So, what Mr. Taylor is saying is basically you can disregard the bulk of my staff report because it was done and submitted prior to the conversation with the applicant. So, I talk about two different building materials for screening, that's off the table. I talk about the relocation of the loading space, that's off the table. I talk about the need for additional parking, that's off the table. So, basically what Planning Commission has to look at this evening is to decide that the proposed screening material, which is a ribbed metal panel that is similar to the color of the brick is appropriate and that the addition of the silo and the oil storage tank is appropriate there. So, you can disregard the biggest chunks of this staff report because they have clarified what they are asking for.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Shvezda did you have anything?

Mr. Shvezda: No comments.

Chairman Darby: Okay, so why don't we hear from the applicant. Thanks for coming.

Mr. Tooley: Good evening, I'm Brian Tooley, I'm the CFO of Ditsch USA. I'm at 6179 Winding Creek Blvd. in Hamilton, Ohio. Overall if you guys recall the reason why we have this silo and why we have this enclosure is we are in the midst of expansion. I know that we have been talking about it for a while but we actually have prints and we have some guys here that are going to make it happen once we get this approved. The silos are going to hold the whole grain wheats and the silos right now are not being used because we are able to get by with bags but with the expansion and the speed that we are going to, because I don't know if you guys know but we are running almost 7/24 now. We have filled out our capacity and we need to get going on this pretty quickly. The silos themselves are an enabler for us to add additional machines and keep up with that level. So, we can't do that with bags, obviously. The addition of the oil was a shared space because when you think about needing oil for the product as well that it was easier to moat, easier to control and manage than in a building like this. So, part of the construction of this will include the moating and that. John and Tom will handle the technical questions on this because as I said I am the finance guy so I know enough to be dangerous in that area. We expect that we are going to be using the 3 silos in the future, so what we are trying to do is get a master plan for the future of the site, not just one at a time. So, we are building this to be the final addition that we would do for this part of the business to support the structure of three manufacturing lines in that building which is what our vision is in the near future. I think that that's leading up to John who is with Process Plus and he is going to take you through the details of the plan.

Again, thanks to Christine and Gregg both were the ones who came to us and said, Brian we are confused can you come over and help us and so they were gracious enough to entertain us last Friday to make sure that we had this in time for a productive meeting today. So, thanks again for the help guys.

Mr. Schlagetter: John Schlagetter, I'm an Architect with Process Plus. I appreciate your time tonight and I also appreciate my boss Ken Popham sitting in for me last Friday since I was out of town and was not able to meet with the City. I also want to apologize for the confusion. I attempted to be brief in the application regarding the nature of the change to the approved plan, so apparently I left too many unanswered questions in the paperwork. So, I appreciate the clarification that we are getting. So, what we are proposing

Mr. Okum: Could you speak a little louder sir.

Mr. Schlagetter: Yes, absolutely, I'm sorry.

Chairman Darby: Can the system be adjusted up because you seem

Mr. Schlagetter: It might be me, I try not to shout.

Chairman Darby: We shout here.

Mr. Schlagetter: Sometimes, I go too far the opposite direction. So, as Gary was mentioning, we are proposing a larger mat, I believe what commission had looked at previously was approximately 18' x 35' based upon the current arrangement. This is closer to about 36' x 56'. The three silos and the oil storage tank are the primary pieces of equipment. We would also have a small enclosure for the flour blowers. The enclosure would contain the blower equipment for sound attenuation purposes and we would also have at least one oil pump. That equipment is not shown because those systems have not been designed yet but those would be contained on the mat. As Brian was indicating, the mat would be designed for spill control and secondary containment so essentially the mat would be slightly depressed from the edge of the existing asphalt paving, we would have a ramp down into it. We are essentially looking at somewhere between four to eight inches of curb height. What we would be looking at is spill control for the 8,000 gallons of oil in the event of a catastrophic upset as well as 25 year, 24 hour storm event which typically works out to about three to four inches of water. What the slab would be required to do is slope to a corner. We are proposing that we would include a sump. Essentially, that collects storm water on a regular basis. That sump would have a manual discharge valve to storm. So, the process typically is that in the event of a storm event or snow melt, Ditsch/Pretzel Baron personnel go out, they verify that there is no oil contamination in that sump, the valve is manually opened to release the storm water to drain. In the event that there is oil there, that is collected, skimmed off and disposed of properly. Sometimes, in these cases where we have these types of oil containment systems, we will put in what is called a hand on auto off sump pump where again the Ditsch employee performs a visual check to ensure that there is no contamination, start the sump pump that discharges to storm and then it auto stops once the level reaches the low level. In this particular case we are going with a more simple technological approach. We would have similar spill control for the truck unload spot, locating the truck unload next to the spill containment mat facilitates that so essentially we don't need secondary containment of storm water around the truck unload because it is an attended operation. The most that you'd typically look at would be a nuisance leak at the point of connection. That could then also be spill controlled within the drainage mat itself. The flour silos are self-contained. The top of the equipment proposed by the vendor is 35 feet. We wanted to max out the screen wall height at 36 feet just for protection. The mat is actually two feet below the elevation of the building itself if you recall along the north wall. I apologize for the confusion, my north up orientation creates relative to what you have seen previously. As an architect I always try to get north up as much as possible because it helps me understand things. There is a loading dock door on the north wall facing Northland Boulevard now that is about two feet above grade so when we think about the height of the elevation, we start two feet below the floor level. There is about a two foot drop off on the grade so

we'd be taking a look at berming that up to get a consistent height around the outside of the screen wall. The screen wall that we are proposing is metal siding as originally proposed I believe. I don't know that the orientation was discussed at that time. The minutes from the meeting reflect the possibility of earth tones. What we are proposing is essentially to have a factory custom finish on the metal siding to match the brick color of the building so that it blends in versus calls attention to itself since essentially what we are trying to do is screen the silos from view we didn't necessarily think we needed to draw the public's attention to it. To reinforce that, we are proposing a couple of different options here and I like options because it lets me hear from you about your thoughts. The first would be more of a traditional ribbed siding but we would orient it horizontally, again to kind of mimic the course work of the brick on the building versus what you would traditionally see where the metal siding is oriented vertically and now all of a sudden it is different from the brick building so it is calling attention to itself. Another option would be a system that you see on the right which is about a one foot panel. Again, we minimize the vertical joints and emphasize the horizontal joints so it kind of takes that brick course work and the building today is about 19 feet tall, call it 21 to grade so now that we are going up to 36 feet it kind of takes the scale of the brick and enlarges it to the scale of the wall that we'd be proposing. So, again we are trying to be very contextual both in terms of the color and the orientation of the material. Since we are looking at being on the north and west elevations we are not going to have a lot of shadow lines but we will be in shade so there will be some opportunity there for a little bit of visual play for interest. It also helps to break the wall up given that it is 36 feet tall and I can't say that enough and it is 56 feet long so it is a big wall. It is set far back off of Northland Boulevard but we think, going with the horizontally oriented siding provides a little bit of visual interest so that it is not just a big blank wall. We had not submitted a revised landscaping plan. We were respecting the work that was done previously understanding that there were comments about updating that that we would incorporate into the permitted work. One option that we are looking at would be to essentially include approximately four feet of louver at the base of the wall. That is the gray band that you can see on this particular elevation. The idea there is that that allows the majority of the wind to flow through the enclosure, improving the structural design since we are essentially looking at a 36 foot tall vertical cantilever that is going to have to resist that wind load on both sides. By putting a four foot louver at the bottom we will be able to get a significant portion of that wind out of the enclosure and it would be screened from the public facing sides by the landscaping that would be in front as well. There was a question in the staff comments about lighting. So, we are not proposing any new lighting on the exterior of the screen wall. Any lighting that we would provide would be on the inside of the enclosure for maintenance and safety purposes. We do not anticipate night time operations. I believe that we are pretty much looking at one unload a day.

Mr. Tooley: Yeah, one load a day for right now. We think that that's approximately 40,000 pounds of flour (talking off mic. not audible).

Mr. Schlagetter: So, essentially one truck load a day is currently intended. Receipts typically occur in the morning so we are not taking a look at night time operations. Similar situation with the tank truck unload. One thing that is really beneficial at receiving the oil in bulk is that it is currently being received in five gallon containers on pallets which is not only a lot of manual effort it is a lot of solid waste. So, the waste stream from the site would be reduced significantly by bringing in 8,000 gallons of oil in at a time versus a truck load of five gallons at a time, just a lot more of it. So we see a net benefit there to the overall truck traffic. Given that the zoning does call attention to the need to limit or eliminate noise contamination, we did go out with a noise meter and I included the report of our findings in the application. So, we found that the decibel levels typically were not exceeding 80 DB and again as a day time operation, we are not expecting that there would be noise complaints where

Mr. Okum: could you repeat that, I did not hear your numbers.

Mr. Schlagetter: Yeah. I appreciate that. So, we had included a copy and we called it a project memo of a noise analysis that we did. We actually had a truck come out to the site and we measured the background sound level at 62 DB's and at various points

around the site. On page two of that memo you can see the various readings that we came up with. So, essentially at the edges of the site we get down to 72 decibels, 78 decibels, 67 decibels. So, in most cases the sound level decays back to almost background at the perimeter of the site during that truck unload operation. That was just with the tractor so with the powder or hopper truck itself, the truck driver suggest that the sound level may be even lower.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: The memo I saw you all looking for was not included in your packet so it is not there.

Mr. Okum: We didn't find it.

Chairman Darby: Have you had the chance to review it?

Mr. Taylor: Yes sir.

Chairman Darby: So you are okay with it?

Mr. Taylor: Correct.

Chairman Darby: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Schlagger: That test was actually done at two different RPM's on the blower 800 revolutions per minute and 1200 RPM's just to see if the pitch would change.

Chairman Darby: Excuse me.

Mr. Schlagger: Yes.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Ramirez.

Mr. Ramirez: Yes. Thank you Mr. Chairman. I have a question about your panels. Is that the actual color?

Mr. Schlagger: So, what I have

Mr. Ramirez: You said that they are going to customized?

Mr. Schlagger: Yes, so what I had my guys do, we received a couple of samples from a manufacturer, the standard white panel so we had a couple of my employees go out and color match the brick so these are brush outs. So, what we would get would be a custom factory color like a Kynar finish that would ship in the custom color.

Mr. Ramirez: The copies that we have, the red is bright red.

Mr. Schlagger: So, right and Liz kind of pointed this out to me when I did the packet drop off. The color is even different between the 11 x 17 and the 24 x 36. Unfortunately, I can't really control how printers produce color.

Mr. Ramirez: I'm in the printing business.

Mr. Schlagger: Sir?

Mr. Ramirez: I said I'm in the printing business, yes that can be done easily.

Mr. Schlagger: I need to buy one of your printers. So, within the software, the design software, we are matching the color. The color looks good in the PDF but no matter which printer we sent it to it just rendered differently.

Mr. Ramirez: So, do you have a PMS color number?

Mr. Schlagetter: I can provide that. From the custom color.

Mr. Ramirez: So we can look it up on a monitor and get an idea.

Mr. Schlagetter: Yeah, from the custom color that we had mixed, absolutely.

Mr. Ramirez: Okay. That is all I have, thank you.

Chairman Darby: While we are discussing the panels, does commission have any input about the two different models based on the descriptions that were given? Mr. Okum.

Mr. Okum: Just a couple of comments in regards to the panels. We are going to see a lot more of this silo surround than we did when it was originally two without the oil tank. We are now projecting 35 feet on the, it is 37 feet on the west side of it. So, if you are coming down Northland Boulevard, the entrance to our Municipal garage, you are going to see the whole side of that silo, not just part of it, you are going to see all 37 feet of it. So, we need to be concerned about how that really does look not just steel panels looking there. It's a pretty big element. I just wanted the commission to understand that because, you know you look at the drawing and you say, okay but now we are sticking out 37 feet, we are 54 feet across, there could be some, what do they call those, grand Arborvitae, those huge things that grow 25, what is it called Mrs. McBride?

Mrs. McBride: Just that huge things.

Mr. Schlagetter: Yeah, we had

Mr. Okum: Huge Arborvitae.

Mr. Schlagetter: Yeah, we had discussed possibly, Junipers, Cypress, or

Mr. Okum: It is going to need a lot to break that up.

Mr. Schlagetter: Or even bamboo. As a quick growing

Mr. Okum: And I'm not overly

Mr. Schlagetter: Containable, I know

Mr. Okum: I'm not overly sold on either of those when you go 37 feet tall because you are always going to have a seam at those are 18 foot or 20 foot panels so you are going to have a seam at 20 foot, it needs something to break it up. I mean we haven't even talked about the, I guess the refrigeration unit on the back yet but along Northland Boulevard I want to make sure that we are all good on what we are seeing from Northland Boulevard. I'm talking old time, the City of Springdale build the Municipal garage, how many years ago? 40 years ago 30 years ago? A long time ago and I fought, I was a Council member at the time and I fought over because we were going to put that steal panel on that building and that was the panel that was going to go on to the face of that building and we actually modified it to the aggregate panels and they probably cost the city a fortune to maintain it now but on the other hand we went to the aggregate panels along Northland Boulevard because it was a, this is a pretty important Boulevard in our city and we were very conscious of that. I think we should be just as concerned because this is going to be sticking out there for everybody to see. So, we really need to be adaptive but still, because we understand the issue, you are fitting ten pounds into a five pound sack. So, we are encouraged by our success and we are glad that it is happening in Springdale. So, those are all good things and now we just have to see how it is going to work. I do have some concerns over the two panels that have been submitted for that façade.

Mr. Schlagetter: So, Mr. Okum, you would be looking for more articulation or perhaps a variation in the panel?

Mr. Okum: Maybe a different material, yeah something because of the size of it, I think we are going to have to have a fairly good illustration what that is going to look like.

Mr. Schlagetter: Okay.

Mr. Okum: I don't have a really big problem of its location. I understand the need for that location and I supported that but on the other hand I think we need to be able to see that visually and right now we can't.

Mr. Schlagetter: Okay. Is it worth showing the other option?

Chairman Darby: Excuse me. Mr. Bauer.

Mr. Bauer: Thank you Mr. Chairman. A couple of questions and I guess I agree with Mr. Okum, I'm a visual person. That helps me a little bit but I can't fathom with the height of that and the length of that is going to look like.

Mr. Schlagetter: Okay.

Mr. Bauer: So, I would have a hard time, and I believe like he said you would have to do something to break that up over that height. That being said, I don't remember other than that rendering Mr. Taylor put up there what we approved the last time and what the size of that was. Give me a little help there?

Mr. Taylor: It was approximately the same height but it only protruded out the front about 18 feet and it was about I think 37 feet across the front. So, we are looking at the projection towards Northland is about double what was previously approved and it is about 1 ½ times as long along Northland as this particular model.

Mr. Bauer: And we were okay with, did we have more information than we have right there that you are showing the last time when we approved this?

Mr. Taylor: No, that's it.

Mr. Bauer: Okay. Well then I will take back my comment because that to me sticks out more than whatever we are going to do here. So, regardless, I appreciate staff's help in getting this clarified because when I looked at this packet, I thought, Oh my goodness we are trying to shove a bunch of stuff in a building that isn't, that doesn't look like you have the space. I'm glad you have gone back and done some kind of planning and you've talked about a master plan to know that if it will fit in that building because that was my concern that you were going to try to modify this thing and we were just here in August. What's going to be the next eight, twelve months going to be like and are we going to be adding something else that really doesn't fit in this locale and how long are you going to be here in Springdale.

Mr. Tooley: Well to that affect we are dedicated to be here in Springdale for a very long time. In fact the first, or the main question that Mr. Mayor gave us a couple of weeks ago when we got together was, how much more can you do here? So, we were thinking beyond this because with the growth patterns that we are having here we are going to need to potentially expand even beyond this the way that we are going right now. The main thing is without sounding trite, we grew up a little bit so we had an original architect that came in here that kind of knew what was going on. We found the need half way through this analysis that we needed a professional outfit to do the master plan and that is the reason why we got Process Plus here. So, it was kind of a notch up on the thoroughness that we are trying to do. There will be other expansion plans that we will talk to you a little bit about that is part of the master plan. Nothing that is going to be extravagant or anything like that. The things that are going to be needing your kind of action right now is just this but we've got the entirety of what this site needs to go through to handle three lines. We have thought through that and now we are doing it in the stages. So, right now this is the one stage that we know you guys need to know

about now for us to expand and get the permitting to be able to expand for the second line.

Mr. Bauer: Is that that enclosure, is that gated then on the one side so the general public can't just walk up and into the silo area where you have all of the pumps and various other equipment?

Mr. Tooley: It will be well lit and we were going to secure it. We were talking through it not only for our own safety to make sure that we had everything for our employees properly safe but also for the residents who might be curious on what was going back here because obviously the main thing for us, aside from their safety is also the protection of the product. We are responsible for the product when it goes into the silos so we take that very seriously because anything that happens to the flour from that point is going into our product so that is also going to be a concern as well.

Mr. Bauer: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Tooley: You are welcome.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Okum.

Mr. Okum: Just a couple other questions. So, on this drawing here that we were presented it showed an unloading area 60 x 15. Is that going to be placed there or is it going to be placed next to the building.

Mr. Schlagger: So, I think with the recommendation we will locate that adjacent to the silo entankment. We had proposed it in that location originally as a long term location. Indifference to the potential for an additional location of the bakery, however; it sounds like the best approach is to locate it close coupled to the unload mat where the flour and the oil will be stored. If in the future an addition needs to relocate it that will be the future's problem.

Mr. Okum: So, there are parking spaces across that front that are counted right? Mrs. McBride?

Chairman Darby: Yes.

Mrs. McBride: Yeah, so what came in, what I talked about, if that loading space went there then we would be short on parking, we had to go to the BZA because this is loading space in the front yard and they had to get a variance on parking or restripe more parking spaces. My understanding is, although they submitted that, that is not what they want to do now, that is not what they are going to do. The loading spaces is going to stay where we originally approved it, where it makes sense next to the flour silos so the truck backs in and unloads the flour into the silos and then it pulls back out. So, it doesn't alter any of the parking on the site, it doesn't change the location of the loading space which the BZA has already approved that location in the front yard.

Mr. Okum: Okay, against the building, sort of against the building?

Mrs. McBride: Correct. It backs up right to where those silos are. Where we approved it a year ago in August. And where the BZA approved it.

Mr. Okum: Okay, so they won't need additional parking?

Mrs. McBride: No.

Mr. Okum: Okay. Fire suppression for this. I mean silo issues, fire?

Mr. Schlagger: No, that's a great question. I was going to address it off of Brian's last point. So, there was, before we became engaged and after this approval there was a design that was presented to Pretzel Baron to actually put the flour silos into a building. Flour is a combustible dust. Once you put flour silos into a building you have to do one

of two things. You either have to vent the silo outside the building in the event of over pressure situation or you have to vent the building. So, if the silo vented into the building then the building has to be vent to the outside. That also creates an H2 hazardous occupancy. Once you put that H2 hazardous occupancy you now have the requirement for emergency ventilation. That design was not fire suppressed from a sprinkler stand point. It was fire separated from the bakery, however; and the building will have to be of damage limiting construction so the structure would need to resist 100 PSF minimum of pressure and have about 2,000 square feet of vent relief panels relieving at not more than 20 PSF. We went through a fairly exhaustive option analysis and we landed back at having outdoor silos. So, essentially the silos themselves would be considered a U utility occupancy. When the flour is unloaded from the truck into the silo it is received into what is called a filter receiver. The silos themselves are maintained at atmospheric pressure they are not pressure vessels and the air within the silo escapes through, essentially a filter sock. In the event of an over pressure situation then that pressure relief panel on the silo opens and you get a little pop of flour. The risk that you have with the building is that if you have the accumulation of dust within the building and you get that pop you also have more ignition sources inside the building.

Mr. Okum: Sure.

Mr. Schlagetter: Now you might get a deflagration even that lifts that dust up and that is the explosion that causes the damage and the injury. By having the silos outside of the building we eliminate that risk. We eliminate a lot of the electrical hazard classification that comes with handling the combustible dust and we still do not really have a deflagration risk within the silo itself because there is no ignition source. Essentially what we are looking at is a potential over pressure situation if we are putting too much flour into the silo and/or a filter is clogged but typically we have pressure indicating transmitters and essentially the unload operator on the truck, they tend to unload by sound. So, once they start to hear the whine and they know that there is an over pressure situation in the silo and the line they shut the truck down. With regards to the oil we are talking about vegetable oil. Some being soybean, sunflower etc. That's a class 3B combustible. In unsprinklered occupancies if this were a building we could have up to 13,200 gallons before it would become an H3 hazardous occupancy. Being that we are outside of the building and only at 8,000 gallons this would still be treated as a S1 moderate hazard occupancy for the oil tank itself.

Mr. Okum: Even when you put it next to the grain?

Mr. Schlagetter: Correct. The two risks are not, they don't compound each other. Essentially the oil would have the potential to wet the flour and reduce its combustibility, because it is not going to be airborne anymore. From a food safety standpoint, so there are two things, one obviously from a profit maximization product loss elimination stand point it is in Ditsch/Pretzel Baron's best interest to maintain these systems in a leak free condition. If we are blowing flour out we are losing money, if we are blowing oil out we are losing money. Then also from a maintenance stand point in regards to food safety we want to essentially reduce the risk of contamination from what we call vectors, birds, insects and rodents. So, essentially it is in Pretzel Baron's best interest to maintain this area in a very clean, neat and sanitary way. Similar to the inside of the bakery. So, essentially you don't want to have attractive nuisances that would create the potential for food contamination by letting flour and oil accumulate.

Mr. Okum: So, if I may Mr. Chairman, I'll just finalize.

Chairman Darby: Please do.

Mr. Okum: I'm, you know, the only hang up I've got is how that exterior of that silo is finished. I think you that is something that we need to discuss. I can't, I could not comfortably make a motion on it this evening and vote in favor of it because I don't know what I've got as a finish. I'd like to see some other alternatives from you.

Mr. Schlagger: So, can I show you plan B. So, to go the opposite direction, so this is our base proposal, however; Pretzel Baron had asked us to look at more of a perforated panel system. So, in this particular case the material and color you can see are contrasting with the brick versus complimenting it. The particular material we are rendering there would essentially be a perforated aluminum panel. This is a 3/8 inch diameter. This is a 3/4 inch diameter so, essentially we would articulate the screen wall with the perforations. It's option B or plan B or option two because it does create the potential to "see the silos through it". Now, given that we are driving along the north side of the bakery the silos would always be back lit but what it does create is the potential for a lot of play of light and shadow through the screen wall to liven up that particular corner of the building. It obviously in this case does draw attention to itself but perhaps in a way that it is actually a little bit engaging. I think the average motorist will not realize what is behind this particular screen wall are silos. What they are going to see is a play of light and shadow and color. The standard color for the silos is white. They are available in other colors. So, in terms of going the opposite direction of having an opaque wall we have the opportunity to have some transparency if we still think that will meet the intent of screening the silos.

Chairman Darby: What color were would those be?

Mr. Schlagger: This is a mill finish aluminum.

Chairman Darby: Okay.

Mr. Schlagger: So that would be our proposal.

Chairman Darby: So you would be okay with that color versus the red color?

Mr. Schlagger: Right. So again it's kind of a choice. Do we want it to blend in and go away or do we want to go ahead and celebrate it and not pretend that it is not there. Not treat it as the elephant in the room. Recognize the fact that it is 36 feet tall, 37 feet on one side and 55 feet on the other and do something with that. There is again the opportunity at night when we do have a little bit of night lighting inside the enclosure for safety and security and maintainability that you would get those little punches of light, low level and we are not seeing the need for high lighting, but again there is the opportunity to create an element out of this corner if that meets the intent. I really didn't get a read from the minutes from last year about whether the commission wanted this to go away visually or just hide the silos regardless of how that was done.

Chairman Darby: We have another question. Mr. Ramirez.

Mr. Ramirez: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I noticed as you are flipping that around I can see the reflection of the light. Would that structure be a problem with sunlight and motorists driving by that?

Mr. Schlagger: It should not. We can take a look at that particularly in the afternoon sun. So, on the north elevation it would not. With our software we can do kind of a solar lighting analysis and have the sun track around let's say on June 21st when it is at the highest in the sky, longest day, setting furthest to the north. What I was going to suggest also to address some of Mr. Okum's concerns is that it sounds like we will be tabled to get some resolution of some outstanding questions, we can actually prepare a rendered video to simulate motorists driving east and west on Northland Boulevard to kind of see how the façade can be articulated and how that could work with the daylight to give you a better idea of what the articulation could look like.

Chairman Darby: Someone previously stated that we really need to see more so if that would contribute to that need that would be very helpful for us.

Mr. Schlagger: I can do a bigger drawing or I can do a video. So, this was kind of again, addressing a request from Pretzel Baron that we look at kind of a perf panel option or a mesh option as well as again going the opposite direction, changing the color to lighten it up as well as possibly having some transparency through it.

Mr. Ramirez: Will that require any maintenance, will that rust?

Mr. Schlagger: No.

Mr. Ramirez: No, no maintenance.

Mr. Schlagger: No. It is a mill finish

Mr. Ramirez: Weeds growing between it?

Mr. Schlagger: Well, weeds aren't in the landscape plan.

Mr. Okum: It's going to get dirty, it will be gray and dirty after a while.

Mr. Schlagger: So again the idea would not be that this get planted to become a vertical garden.

Mr. Okum: So would brick.

Mr. Schlagger: We would not want this to become

Mr. Ramirez: That is all I have. Thank you.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Okum.

Mr. Okum: That is a pretty expensive system I would think

Mr. Schlagger: I think we were saying it was comparable.

Mr. Okum: Okay. I mean

Mr. Schlagger: Little bit, a bit of a premium.

Mr. Okum: I'm going to need to see more.

Mr. Schlagger: Sure.

Mr. Okum: I'd be more inclined to a Stowe finish or a concrete panel finish with some breaks in it then I would what we are seeing.

Mr. Schlagger: Okay.

Mr. Okum: I hate to be that way but there is just so much element there

Mr. Schlagger: Sure.

Mr. Okum: On Northland Boulevard that you are going to see that, and I don't have a problem with it contrasting being an accent. I mean Pretzel Baron has greys and red right? What is your colors? Color scheme?

Mr. Tooley: Well the old Pretzel Baron was brown and grey (talking off mic. not audible)... converted to red. (Talking off mic. not audible).

Mr. Okum: So it is red and grey or is it red red?

Mr. Tooley: It is red but the color of the emblem is white with, white background with red writing. So that is where we are going to be on the front sign when we eventually get a front sign and along the side so you see that. (Talking off mic. not audible)

Mr. Okum: It would be nice to have like, if you are going to have a monument sign and an element there and you've got those upper facades on the building that obviously

you could treat with something that ties to that corner that you could color coordinate it and get a contrast of color. I'm not trying to design it for you, I'm just saying, you know, personally I don't have a problem with it. Trying to match it the worst thing in the world to do because it never does. My feeling is that you are better off getting a contrast or an accent to it than you are trying to match it. You've got builders sitting here guys that work in the building trades, you have got three of us up here that are in the building trades and we know it just doesn't work every time we try.

Mr. Schlagetter: Yeah, particularly with reds because you know they do have a tendency to fade. We are benefitting largely from having the northern exposure and the late afternoon exposure on the west side. So that would reduce the fade potential.

Mr. Okum: Personally I think if it was translucent or it was a panel that had perforations in it like what we were looking at I think you would see too much of the silos. Especially lit at night. You'd basically, they would jump right out at you. So, I probably would not support that. Thank you.

Chairman Darby: Does staff have any comments that they want to put into this?

Mrs. McBride: The only direction that I would give the applicant is that if they are going to come back you need to submit a landscape plan. I think you have heard from the commission that is going to be part of the consideration of the whole expansion of the silo area. So we are going to need to have a landscape plan/

Mr. Schlagetter: Sure, we can incorporate that into the current layout. Are there any objections to the size of the silo mat itself? One of the reasons we wanted to get on the calendar tonight, even recognizing that we have some open questions to move forward with is we want to proceed with some engineering for the mat itself to support Pretzel Baron's production needs in order to move forward when appropriate with a building permit application for that.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Ramirez.

Mr. Ramirez: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just something quick before we go to a motion or a vote. I would just like to say that I don't have enough information to decide one way or another.

Chairman Darby: I think that is a pretty prevalent attitude at this time. Mr. Hall.

Mr. Hall: I'd like to echo Mr. Ramirez's comments along with Mr. Okum's there is just not enough information that the applicant's provided here. Thank you.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Okum.

Mr. Okum: You were asking about size. As long as it is architecturally treated effectively, I am of the understanding that I'd be okay with that provided that it is treated with that and a landscape plan showing, and not 20 years from now.

Mr. Schlagetter: Right.

Mr. Okum: I mean, but there are some very large vertical, and you are an architect so you know, landscaping tree type of elements that you can use that would break up some of that elevation.

Mr. Schlagetter: Yes.

Mr. Okum: At the low end, 37 feet we are going to see it but at least you know where we are at.

Mr. Schlagetter: Got it. Thank you.

Mr. Okum: Thank you.

Chairman Darby: We are prepared or at least the chair is, with your agreement the chair is prepared to accept the motion to continue this but if you want, we could go to a vote it is up to you?

Mr. Tooley: I'd like to clarify this because I'm a little confused, I thought this was going to go a little different. First on the panel types, when we get into that, is there something that we can shoot for because right now I was, that was a part that I was surprised about so again I've not been in many of these things so take that for a grain of salt because I'm a finance guy, architecture is not my game.

Chairman Darby: Well let's deal with that question. Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Taylor: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Let's just go back in time a little bit to August, 2017 and at that point in time, I believe that it was very clearly stated to you all that the intention of the city was to have this thing fully screened which was the, and in fact even though the screening was shown open on one end the idea was to, as much as humanly possible, to effectively have this as an enclosed thing. So, I think and we have tried to share that with you guys on several occasions that it was not the City's desire to be able to see the silos period. So, now if the commission wishes to weigh in on this please feel free, I'm not trying to speak for you guys but I know that the feeling 16 months ago was that this was supposed to be an enclosure. I guess I would like some comments from you folks if I am in error.

Chairman Darby: That is my recollection.

Mr. Tooley: Where I was going with it was on the type of materials that we are looking at is it the shape or, and this is where you guys can come back and do this because I need to go back and talk to our folks as well because this is not just Process Plus but it is obviously our responsibility to make sure that this goes right. Is it the type of material here or did you say something about the break that you were looking for that you were looking for some breaks in it to help break it up. I was looking for a little more specifics around where we can target this on the material type because obviously the see through is not going to be palatable.

Chairman Darby: Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup.

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I believe that it was Mr. Okum or Mr. Bauer who said that they named quite a few different building materials either brick façade, some sort of different materials that would break that up and it was also the color that we wanted to know. I know that you said you were going to try to match it to the building but as we have all said that we have several different colors that we are looking at. We are looking at a red, we were are looking at like a brownish terra-cotta color. We are looking at like a burgundy in that picture. They are all different representations and we want to know exactly what it is going to look like. A better idea of what we are voting on because I don't know if I'm voting on that color or the color on this paper or the color on the big paper. I want to know more of that. We just want to kind of have a better idea of what we are going to be looking at when we see it, what are we going to see exactly. It is a very big wall. It is a very high wall and we need to know that we are not just looking at a big wall, we want to see exactly what it is going to look like. It is it going to have some sort of vegetation around it that is going to shield part of the wall. Are we looking at something that is going to have a break in it so that there is different things to look at? We want to know exactly what it is we are going to see. Please correct me if I'm wrong but that's what I was hearing from everybody is that. That's what we wanted.

Mr. Tooley: So, when we get into the pictures or the pictorials that will help support this in the next wave then we just need to get honed in on that one area. Make sure that we've got the right colors in here and that it is consistent both on the metal but also on the pictures. Then we need the material to be something that breaks up to where, I think the intent was and forgive me if I'm wrong, that that was kind of trying to mimic also the flow of the brick as well. So even though it is not brick it would look

like brick and that is what the intent was with this is to make sure that the horizontal lines were the ones that we were carrying through.

Mr. Schlagger: Right and using the horizontal lines to try to visually lower the wall.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Okum mentioned architectural treatment and that is where you come in.

Mr. Tooley: So those are the two main things. The landscaping we knew was going to be something that we were working through and by the way, I personally prefer the landscaping over the other wall to so I'm glad that that change was pushed back on that. That was a win for us as well. Alright, and again I appreciate you guys asking for clarity, I think it is my Proctor and Gamble background. I always need to go back through and make sure that I understand fully all of the stuff I need to do to where we don't repeat this the next time around.

Mr. Okum: We don't mind helping.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Bauer.

Mr. Bauer: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just the visual that you talked about, a walk through a 3D visual is very appealing to me. I deal with that all the time in my line of work and it is very easy to see and very easy to visualize what that screening would look like. I think it would be very helpful to everybody if that is a possibility.

Mr. Tooley: Well thank you for letting me ask.

Mr. Okum: Do you want a motion to continue?

Chairman Darby: Yes. The chair will accept the motion.

Mr. Okum: I move to continue this to the next meeting by the request of the applicant.

Mr. Hall: I'll second that Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Darby: Moved and seconded that this application be continued till our next meeting. Secretary please call the roll.

(Secretary called the roll and the motion to continue the case to the next meeting was approved with a vote of 7 to 0.)

Chairman Darby: See you next time.

Mr. Schlagger: Thank you very much. Appreciate it.

Mr. Okum: See you next month, looking forward to it. Thank you guys.

IX. DISCUSSION

Chairman Darby: Mr. Okum.

Mr. Okum: Just, and I have talked to Mr. Taylor about this and staff is working on some things I'm sure, the re-lamping situation is getting more. I reported to Temple, what's it called now, the school.

Mr. Taylor: Well it's, they still call it the Temples site, and it's called the Bishop Center for Calvary. We're currently working on Kerry Ford, the Days Inn and at the Temple Baptist site trying to get all of these into compliance. Sadly, in particular the Bishop Center, you may recall those guys were, I think, very much interested in getting on board with what the City was really looking for and my suspicion and this is just conjecture on my part. Some people are coming and telling them they can save them

all kind of money by going with LED fixtures and that's that and you know Pastor Tom in particular I told him we needed a photometric plan and I got the deer in the headlights kind of thing. So, we are working our way through it but I think this is going to be, as more and more people look at energy saving, this is going to be something that we are faced with on a fairly routine basis because people are used to being able to re-lamp their parking lot. I mean it's, you know, gee we have a burnt out bulb, boom let's go put a new light in and this is a whole new ball game with these LED fixtures. They are much brighter and there is just a lot of changes and we are trying to get there. Of course we are always going backwards to because nobody comes in ahead of time and asks for permission. We are always asking for forgiveness because again everybody is used to, oh it is just re-lamping I don't need a permit for that. Well this is different.

Mr. Okum: Well the reason I was going to bring it up and I appreciate all that you are doing to try to catch it. I don't know when the next City Newsletter is going out or any communication that is going out to the businesses. I think it would be in the best interest of the City is that we tell them that we would be happy to help them and work with them but there are certain zoning standards that are of applicable to the situation. The other question that I had that ties to this is, if, let's say I'm Days Inn and I say I can't comply with that can I get a variance on that? Can I go and apply for a variance?

Mrs. McBride: Yeah.

Mr. Okum: What Duncan Rule would ever approve in Duncan's

Mrs. McBride: You know

Mr. Okum: Duncan's Rules, where would that ever

Mrs. McBride: Look at the bank that you all looked at this evening.

Mr. Okum: It was lamped, yes.

Mrs. McBride: And it was in violation of the zoning code for lighting and you all chose to approve that, because that was a PUD.

Mr. Okum: Because staff felt there was reasonable

Mrs. McBride: Right. So there was outstanding, extenuating circumstances.

Mr. Okum: In a PUD you have that latitude because it is give and take.

Mrs. McBride: Right.

Mr. Okum: But, in straight up zoning

Mrs. McBride: Then the applicant is going to have to prove that.

Mr. Okum: Right. So, my comment to all of us is that, and especially Joe, you're the representative to BZA, I'd hate to see that because once you make the approval of one, we are opening up Pandora's Box for every business that wants to re-lamp. If you've noticed Days Inn is a good example but the church, I feel sorry for those residents that live on the back side of that church because they took that angular pole and they just blanketed that whole back end with light and I noticed, it was a foggy day, foggy morning or foggy night and I was driving over 275 and said Oh My God, it was just amazing just how much extra, how much light. We all know what the LED's do they are phenomenal and it does cost us less and we all should encourage and embrace it but there's. Maple Knoll submitted and LED fixture that is surrounded and screened and it's got shades on it, there's ways of doing it and there's ways of not doing it. So that is the only reason I'm bringing it up. I started to think about it after I spoke to Gregg about it and I says, are these businesses going to say, well I'll go to Board of Zoning Appeals and apply for a Variance and Board of Zoning Appeals is going to have to hear it because

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
11 DECEMBER 2018

PAGE 31

that is the requirements. Thank you. I've stood on my stand for a minute. That's good, thank you.

Chairman Darby: Anything else for discussion? Anything you folks want to share with us to make us smarter?

X. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

None

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. Sullivan-Wisecup: Move to adjourn

Chairman Darby: Moved and seconded, we are out of here. Thank you for a good meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

_____, 2019 _____
Don Darby, Chairman

_____, 2019 _____
Richard Bauer, Secretary