

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
MAY 12, 2015
7:00 P.M.

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Don Darby.

II. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Dave Okum, Richard Bauer, Don Darby, Marjorie Harlow, Bob Diehl, Marge Boice, Carolyn Ghantous

Others Present: Anne McBride, City Planner; Don Shvegzda, City Engineer; Mr. McErlane, Building Official

III. MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF APRIL 14, 2015

Chairman Darby: We'll accept the motion to adopt the Minutes of the previous meeting.

Mrs. Boice: So moved.

(Mrs. Harlow seconded the motion. With six "aye" votes, the Minutes of the April 14th, 2015 Planning Commission meeting were adopted. Mr. Diehl abstained).

IV. REPORT ON COUNCIL

Mrs. Harlow provided a summary report of the April 15, 2015 and May 6, 2015 City of Springdale City Council meetings.

V. CORRESPONDENCE

Chairman Darby: In our package everyone received a copy of an email sent to Mr. McErlane. Mr. McErlane, would you address that briefly, please.

Mr. McErlane: The email that you have actually pertains to Old Business, Item C, that the Applicant for the Communications Tower at 11550 Century Boulevard has asked for further continuance of his Conditional Use Permit hearing as he puts together additional information. We have contracted with a consultant to take a look at the specifics for coverage of the cell tower radio frequency information and those types of things that we don't have the expertise to look at. Our code does require that a cell tower be justified for the location that it's in and at the height that it's located. They are to provide that information to our consultant to review and he's still waiting for additional information from the Applicant so they've asked their item to be continued and we can address that when we get to that.

Chairman Darby: We will. At this time, before we get into Old Business, I'd like to acknowledge that, it's a sad acknowledgement, but this is the last meeting for Mr. Bill McErlane. I have had the honor of working with Bill for three different stints, and he's been a pleasure to work with. He's a consummate professional but I'm going to end it there because I have a person who has a very special relationship with him. She was just over here and she asked me not to do this, but I'm going to ask Mrs. McBride, who has worked with Mr. McErlane for a lot longer than I have, to make a few comments about him.

Mrs. McBride: I just wanted to say that I think that the city of Springdale and their citizens have been exceptionally lucky to have had Mr. McErlane here for almost 30 years. Not only for his dedication to the city, but for keeping our Building Code and our Zoning code current. He's known throughout the development community for working with applicants, trying to take them through the system. They come out with a favorable outcome, both for the development community and for the city. He's obviously going to be very, very missed, not only for his vast history and knowledge of the city, but also for the friendship that he has given all of us.

Mrs. Boice: I think that anyone here can look at me and realize that I probably have known Bill longer than any of you sitting up here on this podium. I have had the pleasure of working with him of various commissions – Board of Zoning, Planning Commission, and of course, City Council. He's very special. I did not realize this date was coming so

quickly. You didn't ask my permission, Bill. I just want to say it has been one of the nicest relationships, to work with a city representative such as you. Enjoy your retirement and let all of our very best wishes go with you.

Mrs. Harlow: I would like to thank Mr. McErlane for all the knowledge that he has imparted. I'm fortunate enough to serve on Zoning Review Committee and it has been very educational for me, to serve on there, and to have the explanation of some of our current zoning and where maybe we need to take that zoning in the future, so I appreciate the knowledge that you've passed on to some of us. Thank you so much.

Mr. Diehl: You know if somebody would ask me how I would describe you, it would be very simple – the true professional. Thank you for all your years of service.

Mr. Okum: Marge, I think we both were here when Bill came on and I'm beginning to feel a little bit older than I thought I was. Bill, you know that we have worked together for pretty much every year that you have been here. In one way or another, you have brought to the City of Springdale that professional position. I wrote down something earlier and it's right – you're a constant rock to the city. You were fair to everyone. I remember when we had a previous Building Official and people would complain that when they brought in a set of plans and they wouldn't work, he'd hand them back to them and say it won't work. The first time that Bill became our chief Building Official, he was there to help developers and residents work through problems. You can't ask anybody to give more to a community than that man has done. You're going to be missed a lot. I want to thank you personally for all your help to me and to the City of Springdale.

Chairman Darby: For your information, Mr. McErlane's replacement is Mr. Greg Taylor. Greg, would you stand please? From this position, I would like to personally welcome you. As you heard with these comments, you have some big shoes to fill; however, I heard you brought a pretty good set of shoes with you.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

- A. Minor Modification to the PUD - Tri-County Commons 600 - 610 Kemper Commons Drive - Alteration to a Pylon Sign. Would the representatives please come forward?

Mr. Koehneke: We're here; I believe in March we started tabling this issue. Basically what we have is a client with a development of about 250,000 s.f. looking to add six panels to his existing pylon sign on Kemper Road. What my client has received are some suggestions that he strongly look at an LED options, and he has indicated that, in one respect, that's a significant cost issue for him, since it's a development that's at a 32% occupancy rate today. It's on top of the investment he's already placed into upgrade the development. He has also indicating that the tenants he has talked to would prefer to have a static panel as their means of advertising their logos, rather than an LED sign. I can't dispute that but I'm sure that's a personal preference as well but these are the comments that his tenants-to-be are telling him. He is at a point where he has asked for the six additional panels which would fall within the regulations allowed by the City of Springdale. From that, he's also asking, given the precedent that's already been established with similar type pylon signs in the area, whether it's be Casinelli, whether it be Tri-County Towne Center, whether it be Springdale beltway center; those are multiple panel signs in the ten to twelve panel range. Depending how they're configured, they could grow more than that, so all we're asking for is consideration for a similar type request to add the six panels and we would lay that before you this evening.

Mr. McErlane read staff comments.

Mrs. McBride: The only things that I would add to that is that the two members of Planning Commission that serve on Council should reaffirm that in fact they do think that this a minor departure from the approved plan, which staff believes it is and that was your decision previously, but for the record, I think you should do that. I would also point out with the additional panels, the proposed sign still meets the requirement for eight foot distance below the bottom panel to the grade, which is required by our code.

Mrs. Harlow: Mr. Chairman, I have no problem with the minor change.

Mr. Diehl: Agreed.

Chairman Darby: For the record, it is approved as a minor modification.

Mr. Shvezda: No comments.

Chairman Darby: We have been here before; we've had quite a bit of discuss about this particular request. We do have a full panel this evening so, if there is a vote, we certainly will not have the problem we had the previous time. So I'd like to open it up for discussion.

Mr. Okum made a motion to approve the additional sign space as requested by the Applicant. Mr. Diehl seconded the motion. The motion was approved with six "aye" votes; Mr. Bauer voted no.

Chairman Darby: Motion is approved. Congratulations.

B. Minor Modification to the PUD - Tri-County Commons 600 - 610 Kemper Commons Drive - Razor Wire Installed Along the Roof

Chairman Darby: Is there a representative present?

Mr. McErlane: Mr. Chairman, I was informed right before the meeting that the owner, or he was going to have a representative here from the fence company to speak, is not going to make it tonight. They're asking to be tabled again, for another month. My suggestion is, if Planning Commission tables it, that we make a suggestion to the owner that there wouldn't be any consideration for further tabling because he's currently in violation and the longer we table it, the longer he's in violation.

Chairman Darby: Plus we have received information from the attorney that we're not empowered to act on this particular issue as presented anyway. So procedurally, we're not going to put it back on the agenda. If it's submitted in another form, we could give consideration to it, but we can not consider him keeping the razor wire on that building.

Mr. McErlane: Then I will inform the Applicant that, per the Law Director, Planning Commission cannot act on something that's prohibited by the code, and that if he has another alternative, he can present it.

Chairman: Okay, thank you. So, in terms of housekeeping, is there an action that is needed?

Mr. McErlane: No.

C. Conditional Use Permit - 11550 Century Boulevard - Communication Tower

Chairman Darby: We received information about this last night about this Conditional Use Permit, there is a request at the table, as explained by Mr. McErlane.

Mr. McErlane: At the last meeting, in order to not have to re-advertise and renounce this Application, Planning Commission opened the Public Hearing and then asked for a motion to continue it and if we can do the same tonight, that will allow us to avoid having to readvertise and resend out notices.

Chairman Darby: At this time we will reopen the process that we started last month. Are there persons here who come to speak about this particular issue?

Mr. Okum: I'd like to move to continue the Conditional Use hearing in process to the next meeting.

(Mr. Diehl seconded and with seven "aye" votes, the motion to continue to the next meeting was approved.)

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Major Modification to PUD - Tri-County Commerce Park - 12100 Princeton Pike (GEEAA Park)

Chairman Darby: Representatives please come forward.

Steve Dragon: Good evening. My name is Steve Dragon. I'm with Vandercar; we're the Applicant and potential developer of the plan before you this evening. With me tonight, I also have Mr. David Wright, Adam Corn, and Dave Meyer, with the Kaiser Group; they are our site Civil and Traffic Engineer for this project. They're available to answer your questions. To begin with, I'd like to once again thank the city staff and consultants for their time, attention, and guidance over the last several months as we have worked through our evaluations and preliminary planning for this project. We have before you tonight a plan for the development of the GE Employee golf course and park. The total development site is approximately 116 acres in size. It encompasses the full GE Park and golf course property. Vandercar currently has all of the subject property on track for purchase. As proposed in the plan, at completion, the project would include new office and industrial buildings, totaling over 1.3 million square feet (s.f.), contained in nine buildings, ranging in size from approximately 25,000 s.f. up to approximately 450,000 s.f. At full build-out, the project represents over \$50M of new investment and, as planned, would support upwards of 1,000 new jobs in the City of Springdale. As you will recall from last month, we were here before you to present a Concept Plan and to seek your input and the community's with regard to the Development Plan. Much of the discussion at that meeting revolved around providing adequate and suitable buffering between the proposed development and existing residential uses, both Heritage Hill to the east of the property and also buffering the existing Crossings at the Park condominium project in the interior of the property.

With that input in mind, with the plan before you tonight, we have increased the size of the buffer yard from the previous plan along the eastern boundary of the project by an additional 25 feet, to a total width of 125 feet against the Heritage Hill subdivision; in that area we'll install earthen mounding with significant landscaping throughout the mounded area. The mound itself will be off-set from the property line into the interior of the project, a suitable distance to allow the existing mature trees along the property boundary to remain in place and to remain healthy. We believe this earthen mound will perform significantly, along with the landscaping, to help mitigate noise and light impacts that might result from the proposed development. We have also increased the boundary adjacent to the Crossings at the Park condominium property, on the east side of that project, by an additional 25 feet as well. This results in a buffer width that is, at a minimum, 75 feet in width between the condominium project property and the proposed Street "B", which runs north and south on the interior of the property. It yields an average buffer yard in that area of over 140 feet in width. The buffer area continues around the south and to the west of that property in that area. Those areas will remain green space as well. The area to the immediate east of the property, the northern portion of it, will be graded so as to maintain the existing mature trees standing in that area, to provide screening, and in the southern part of that area, we'll provide significant landscaping and mounding where available to help buffer against the proposed street and adjacent business uses.

Another of the main themes of the comments from the meeting last month was a concern relative to access and traffic. As planned, this project proposes to have just two primary access points to the external street system - one being to the west of the project, at 747, close to the location of the existing park entrance on 747, and a second entrance on Crescentville Road that will align with Transportation Way across on the north side of Crescentville Road. We have submitted a traffic impact study to the city and we are continuing the city's engineers to finalize that study to identify and nail down the specific improvements required to support the project. We're confident that we'll be able to provide the improvements necessary to support the traffic that will be generated by the project and look forward to continuing to work with the city's engineers to finalize that report.

One of the main concerns we've heard from the residents at the Crossings at the Park condominium project is a concern regarding their access and getting in and out of their property onto the surrounding street system. We think the plan in front of you addresses that very nicely. They'll have access across new city streets to those primary points of access at 747 and Crescentville. The streets are laid out in a way that additional development traffic won't be introduced into that existing residential area so there shouldn't be any additional traffic within their community itself. The proposed access also serves to provide access for the planned future development area that's been designated as an assisted living senior housing area located at the southwestern portion of the property.

Additionally, we heard concerns at the meeting last month that no cross connection be made to the street system in Heritage Hills. As you can see on this plan, none are proposed

in that area. As you are probably aware, and I'm sure staff will go through them all, we've received a number staff comments to the plan. We'd be happy to discuss any of those with you in detail. While I won't attempt to address them all in this presentation, I would like to comment on a few of those issues that are of greatest importance to the viability of the development plan as proposed.

First, with regarding to building setbacks, we have proposed a 75-foot front yard setback generally throughout the project. That dimension is critical to us to allow for sufficient building development area within the project in an effort to provide as much area as we can for buffering against the adjacent uses. In addition, we have proposed that yards that are adjacent to a street but in which there is no parking area be treated as side yards and not front yards. Where that primarily impacts this plan is for Buildings 1 and 8 which front on both the interior development street and also have a frontage on Crescentville. It affects the Crescentville frontage and based on that language, it would leave a setback along Crescentville to the building line of 25 feet. The staff has recommended that that dimension be held at 75 feet; 75 feet would be damaging to our project in terms of the building yield. We would proposed a setback of 50 feet as a compromise for that condition.

The second area of comments I'd like to address would be with regard to the building height. Staff has recommended building heights that are limited with regard to proximity to residential uses. We've also got comments and discussion from the owner of the assisted living property that they would like to see the building located on Building Site four limited to a single story to maintain their visibility. We are here tonight willing to limit both Buildings 4 and 9, which are adjacent to the assisted living and condo areas in that part of the site, to a single story building with a height not to exceed 28 feet but we cannot agree to limit the height of the other buildings on the plan to less than the 48 feet that we have proposed in the plan as submitted.

Third items to address would be hours of operation. There is some suggestion in the staff report that the Planning Commission may want to consider limitations on hours of operations or restrictions in that regard. The proposal in front of you is for development of an institutional-grade business and industrial park. The types of business that will locate in this setting often maintain some level of operation throughout night-time hours including loading and unloading. We cannot execute development of this plan with limitation of hours of operation. This is not a condition that we can live with. We'd be happy to discuss it further with you. I do want to point out we do have, under contract, a prospective tenant for Building 1. This is a tenant that is primarily a supplier and distributor of plumbing supplies. They will plan to perform loading and unloading operations occasionally through the night-time hours in the facility and yard. It's critical that these functions be permitted by the city and that the operations not be deemed a nuisance. We're asking for the city's acknowledgement to these circumstances as part of the approvals for this plan and that the buffering, as proposed, is sufficient to satisfy the mitigation of those impacts.

Finally, the fourth thing I'd like to address is tree preservation. As many of you are no doubt aware of the character of the property – it's heavily treed in many areas with many large-diameter trees. We are seeking relief from the city with regard to its' tree replacement requirements. Given the character of the property and the plan for the development, it is going to be nearly impossible for us to meet the planning requirements as strictly stated in the city's code. By virtue of the buffer yard provisions that we're willing to agree to, and through the city's other landscaping requirements that will be applied to the site development, we'll already be planting hundreds of trees throughout the property. However, because of the large amount of large-diameter trees on the property, we don't think it's feasible or practical to meet the city's tree preservation requirements and replacement requirements. We're requesting that the planning requirements for this PUD be limited to those necessary to meet the buffer yard planning needs that we agree to and the other city landscape provisions for site development and that it not be required to meet the full replacement provisions of the tree preservation regulations.

I would like to conclude my presentation by saying how excited we are about Tri-County Commerce Park and how anxious we are to move forward with this project. We've seen a tremendous interest in the project from the business community in the last few months since it's become public. As I've mentioned, we already have a user under contract for the first building site on the project. We feel that we have multiple interest in both Buildings 2 and 8. We've spoken with multiple parties about Building 3 and also about locations along 275. We think it says great things about the City of Springdale that so many businesses are

excited about the opportunity to invest, locate, and grow in the city. We also think it says very positive things about the plan we have before you tonight in terms of its' addressing the market needs for this particular site. We hope you'll agree and that you'll recommend approval of the PUD Amendment so that we can move forward with our design and with hopes of beginning construction before the year's end. Again, we'd be pleased to answer any questions you may have and address any of the other comments in more specific detail that you request.

Chairman Darby: Thank you very much for your presentation. At this time we'll move on to our staff reports.

Mr. McErlane read staff comments.

Mrs. McBride: The first thing that the two members of the Planning Commission who serve on City Council will need to make the determination that this is a major departure obviously from the approved plan, so we'll need to have that for the record.

In 2002, the City of Springdale adopted a Comprehensive Plan and it did designate this particular area, as we've talked about, for parkland and recreation based for what it was being used for at the time but recognizing that it would redevelop at some point of time in the future. We prepared a series of potential development criteria and I've included those in my staff report, A through N. In summary, it talks about the need for a mixture of land uses, it stresses the need to protect the residential neighborhoods, to establish design criteria for the development, and to create an internal roadway network to preserve the trees wherever possible. It specifically calls out to maintain setbacks on both Crescentville and 747 for the purposes of saving trees and also trying to create a park-like type setting; maintain that as much as possible, and again, stressing buffering and screening between the different land uses. Obviously this is a huge project, and neither the city nor the developer, I would be willing to bet, cannot anticipate what is going to happen with all of this. What I really think is incumbent on us is to start to establish a set of criteria and standards that we can then use to evaluate final development plans when they come in that the developer can represent to potential tenants or buyers of sites, that here's what you can do, here's what the city is expecting, and here's what permitted. With that, what I've tried to do in my staff report then is start to try to establish some of those standards and provisions for the Planning Commission's consideration.

Mrs. McBride then read her staff comments.

Mr. Shvegza: Regarding the Traffic Study, after the presentation on the Concept Plan, review of the traffic study noted that future assisted care facility on the Keystone property, that traffic generation was not included; subsequently, now it has been included. The traffic study has been reviewed and comments just went out so we're at this point unable to fully accept the traffic study; there are several comments that need to be addressed.

Mr. Shvegza then read his staff comments.

Chairman Darby: We've had our presentation and we've had our staff comments. Prior to Commission members' discussion, as we established last month, I'm going to give the opportunity for residents who have comments at this time to please come forward. Do we have any persons here this evening who would like to speak? This is a protocol we established; I think if we hear you as we work through this process, we're going to be a lot better off when we get to the end. Please identify yourselves for the record.

Mr. Thomas Wahl, 401 Lisbon Lane: Mr. Chairman, and all of you very important people, I live inside the park and I'm also one of the owners of the park and I've been fortunate to have been part of several PUDs on the property – one that you did the right thing with in 1986 when you refused a company from New York to come in and the one in 2003 where I think the decision was a good decision. Unfortunately, with the timing and the situation with the economy and the person that we got involved in that project, it just didn't all come together. I'd like to think this project could come together. There are a lot of challenges. I think this is a great opportunity in many ways. The only thing I would urge you to again consider, I know Don, I'm not going to say your last name because I'm not sure I could pronounce it correctly and I apologize for that, but I don't want to mispronounce your name, but I think what you were saying about the traffic light on 747 is that there's no opportunity for that – did you say that or did I misunderstand that?

Mr. Shvegza: At this point, since we don't have all the information regarding the Traffic Study, we wouldn't recommend it at this point.

Mr. Wahl: That is the one thing that, again, living there now and working with Springdale for many years here, that is the one, in my way of thinking, really major consideration for this project to go forward. I would just like to express that on behalf of myself and thank you for your time.

Chairman Darby: Thank you for coming out.

Mrs. Mary Kathleen Stephan, 202 Edinburgh Lane: Thank you for allowing me to speak. When my husband and I purchased the property that we are on, we assumed that it would remain a park of some kind. My husband has passed five years ago. I look around at all of this and I see little "us". I speak for myself and, after speaking with others in our small community, yes, something needs to be done, because we were left high and dry when the bankruptcy occurred and there was supposed to be a larger area – housing, a nursing home, etc. That's kind of coming into play. But as I sit here, my stomach goes upside down because all of this is not what we came there for. Most of us are senior citizens; I don't know if I will be alive to see any of this happen or completed. It's just a pain in my heart to hear and to listen all of this. Life goes on and commerce goes on but it's so strange that we're there and we came because it was a park and now there are big buildings, now there's going to be more traffic. We live with the train. But we're not talking train with all that's going to go on and all of the noise and trauma from the building. I realize life goes on but I had to say this because as I sat here listening to this, my stomach went upside down. I do appreciate you listening to me. Thank you.

Chairman Darby: Thank you for coming out.

Mr. Tom Vanover, 11982 Tavel Court: I am in the lower right-hand corner of that projection (indicating on slide). First thing, I'm glad that we got the increase in the buffer. I did not hear the height of the mounding; that definitely comes into play. The Traffic Study I understand is not completed yet; that will be amazing because I know, you know, what the condition of 747 – Crescentville Road intersection is right now and its' functionality and you're talking not adding just vehicles, but 53' trailers with another 25 foot cab pulling it, so you're talking 75 feet, ballpark, of a vehicle that's going to occupy a turn lane and we have issues out there now with capacity on that Crescentville – 747, especially on Crescentville. Noise - I moved there, 275 is in my backyard. I battled several times with our former City Administrator about getting some regulation on the Jake braking up there, that's when I hear it the most, that, and when the little motorcycle, crotch rockets, and rice burners wind up and take off but there's got to be, I mean, I hear the trucks working the mulch pile, which is probably the bottom right hand corner, clear across a creek in a heavily wooded area and I hear that clearly. I hear the train, but after a while that becomes white noise. This is building heights, lighting, a lot of stuff is a huge concern. That entire street, Ledro, and Tavel, are highly impacted by this and I haven't heard a whole lot of answers on how they're handling the storm water. I've been there since 1981 or 82 and I've seen two five-hundred year storms. 1985 was one, and I think 1988, 89, we had another one. That one, our cul-de-sac was underwater. There's a whole lot of holes and a lot of questions that greatly concern me. I've got several of my neighbors out here and that was just some of the discussions that we had prior to the meeting. They can speak for themselves, I know, and I welcome them to but right now, to me, there's a lot more unanswered questions than there are answered questions. I trust you to do your job. I thanks Mrs. McBride for pushing for the protection of the subdivision back there because like the lady that just spoke, when we moved in, that was a park. When I moved in 275 was there, so if I can't live with that, then shame on me, but the volume is greater now than what is was then, but this definitely will have a huge impact. There's not one portion, whether it's buffering trees, lighting, vehicles, that will not greatly impact that subdivision over there and I call that home and don't intend to go anyplace yet; they'll probably carry me out feet first. That's my concerns. Is the height of the mound been defined yet?

Mrs. McBride: They have submitted a preliminary grading plan and I believe it ranges in height, obviously it's lower at the ends, eight to ten feet, but that's a preliminary grading plan and that's why staff would like to sit down with them when they have a final grading plan so we know what kind of plant material, where to add what and so forth, to give the best buffering.

Mr. Vanover: Okay, I know at last meeting, there was talk ten feet, then suddenly we were talking eight feet and two feet of height is a huge difference. With that I'm done.

Chairman Darby: Thanks Tom. Do we have anyone else?

Mr. Ken Weartz, 228 Edinburgh Lane: I'm the President of the Board of the Condo Association. I spoke here last month and I appreciate it. I gave you the sad story of our plight. What we took over and what ended up happening is not what we expected. I'm going to continue just a little bit along that line. Right now we have a very difficult time getting out of our complex, not just because it's like a race track, there's people leaving out every other way. We have people in their recreation sports, parking on our road. One time I tried to get out and I thought I was going to get in a fight with a guy. There's potholes; it's just not a good environment to live in. This proposal that we've been hearing is a positive thing, I believe, for us. It does have some problems – the noise. I would like to see 150' building down next to 275. That would block off the noise from the highway. I don't know if we can do that, but that would be something that would help. The railroad track, the guy blows his whistle when he goes through the bridge. He doesn't have to do that, he could wait until he gets up to Crescentville Road. Noise is a real issue for everybody. It seems like the one way to solve that noise issue. When you look at the crux of the development - it's neat, orderly, it has straight lines for roads, and they're going to attempt to hold the noise down with the berms. The berms are a very important item in this whole project for the people that live around it. The berms, I don't know how high they can be, eight, ten feet – the higher, the better, but I do know when you're talking about the issues of the trees, that park is filled with rotting trees that are falling down. They need to be replaced with trees that would stay green all year round so that when they're on top of the berm, they can eliminate the noise and dust that flows. For the people that live in that area, Heritage Hill, as well as Crossings at the Park, I think a real strong emphasis should be on that. My vision, for Crossing at the Park, was to see that we would be totally surrounded by a greenbelt area. Our people can get out and get their exercise; they can walk around this greenbelt, these mounds, and feel comfortable and peaceful. That is my vision; I do not know if anybody else has that vision but that is what I would like to see after living there for eight years. I live on Edinburgh. We used to have, the highway had trees along it that blocked off the noise; those were torn down. We thought we would get a wall up along the highway, it didn't appear. Across the street from me was another lane, another road that was going to be built and condos would be on it; that isn't going to happen. The new owner of the land has no plans for that property whatsoever. It seems like it could be turned into another green area. If we could just plant something, put up another berm that would block off more of the noise and dust - that would make not only our life better, but it would give the city more green space. I've thought about that quite a bit because where I live the noise is really heavy because you've got the train and you've got the highway. The motorcycles are really bad; the trucks, as they downshift, are bad, but I think we can counteract some of that if we really think and plan about the berms that are surrounding the property. I have nothing else to say.

Mrs. Harlow: Sir, I have a question – what you would like to see for green space, and you're talking about the landowner, are you talking about the 16 acres for the proposed senior project?

Mr. Weartz: That area is a problem.

Mrs. Harlow: But is that the one you're talking about?

Mr. Weartz: No, it's south of that. It's between the creek and Edinburgh Lane. Part of that property is owned by the new developer, Vandercar, and part of the property is owned by another developer, Crossings at the Park Six. They're the ones that bought all of the property that was incomplete. It's been a real problem to us because we've had to put out a lot of money to do some of the work that the developer should have done. So our funds are being used up but they own that property that's right across from Edinburg, so I'm asking the developer to do something - increase the land on it, but we can't do it unless we have the okay from the people who own the land. So that's where I was going to look for the city to give us some help with getting these two people to get together.

Mrs. Harlow: Okay, I want to make sure that I understand this, because my understanding, when we first started talking about this big piece of property, was that there were the Vandercar project, the Crossing project, and then the sixteen acres that is owned by another gentleman or another company?

Mr. Weartz: Keystone Properties.

Mrs. Harlow: Yes, okay. Where the condos are located and the little green space that you're talking about, are they owned by separate entities?

Mr. Weartz: Keystone Property owns where they are, then there's the cell tower. If you past that cell tower, part of the land is owned by Crossings of the Park Six, and part of the land will be owned by Vandercar. It's that property that I'm looking for something to be done.

Mrs. Harlow: Okay, I think I have an understanding now. We're talking about right here? (indicating on map). I have an understanding of it now; I just wanted to make sure I was clear on it, thank you.

Mr. Weartz: Thank you for your interest.

Mr. Charlie Lee, 411 Lisbon Lane: I have only one sense – we are talking about noise and the grading, but I'm talking about the very fundamental principal. I am not an architect but when I first look at that design, I'm also looking at this building and the surroundings - why here is it so beautiful and why there is it so ugly, why? Because the building and the green space ratio, building and green space ratio. Look at that - the buildings are jammed together and the green space is so narrow. Can we just shrink the buildings by design, by requirement, and attach the green space. Wouldn't it be as beautiful as this building and the next building we have in the municipal complex? So that's the principal that I'm looking at. In Google, in Mountain View, their building and their green space ratio are very different from this. They look like a park and that's what the owners, the residents here, dream about. Thank you, gentlemen.

Chairman Darby: Thank you, Mr. Lee.

Mrs. Boice: Before we get into a full discussion here amongst us, I do want to commend our staff. I think those of you out in the audience have seen that they have certainly left no stone unturned. I just want you to know how much we appreciate that. This is a big project, tough decisions to be made, and all of your input is so valuable and I want to thank you for all of us here on the commission, thank you.

Chairman Darby: We certainly had very good input. At this time, we'll begin our discussion. I do want to start it out by making a comment, and this is just my personal observation and it somewhat supports what has been said here by some other speakers. I served on Planning Commission with a gentleman some years ago and he had a saying. Many times when developers would come in and we would look at their conceptual presentations, he would often say "this looks like ten pounds of sugar in a five-pound bag". I would ask that the developer keep that in mind as we move through this process because it appears, at least at this point, that some of the problems being encountered, or being observed, with this development would be eliminated if the dimensions being presented to us were not what they are; just food for thought. Are there any comments at this time?

Mr. Okum: I've got several questions, I guess for staff to start with. Did the Applicant present any alternatives on the tree replacement responsibilities for the previous 398.5 s.f. or the numbers that will ultimately come out of this development? Other than requesting tonight that they be given relief, total relief?

Mr. McErlane: No, not other than that presentation. For that 398.5 s.f., they presented an amendment to the covenants to eliminate that requirement, and then tonight asked that they only be required to do whatever is required for buffering and whatever is required as far as the landscaping requirements within the code.

Mr. Okum: So there's no tree replacement?

Mr. McErlane: Well, those areas would count as part of the tree replacement, we just don't have a handle on what that is.

Mr. Okum: Yes, those numbers would go in and build up and there's a certain amount of deciduous trees and the gentleman spoke earlier regarding green and evergreens and so forth and those would also be part of that calculation in those numbers, but we don't have any idea of what that is.

Mr. McErlane: No, we don't. Any generally, we wouldn't necessarily require, as the code requires, the same types of category trees, because in this particular case, we would expect more evergreens in the buffer areas than what would be required under the tree preservation ordinance because there are not that many natural evergreens that they're going to be taking down. So, we would allow that substitution.

Mr. Okum: That substitution in order to help that number. Okay, that's one question. The other question I had in regards to, Mrs. McBride, you had made a reference in your considerations and in your presentation that the landscape plan be completed and worked out with the Applicant and I encourage that. I think a template or a basis of what it's going to be works out and then it's blended throughout the site instead of going to each individual; I think that's reasonable to look at something this large. But on the other hand, I think that that one item, I would prefer that that final landscape plan and the buffer yard considerations be a decision at this body's level. Frequently on a single development, we obviously turn it over to staff and we appreciate their input but I think we want to get both hands into this because it is so significant and I would encourage that. I believe our code does address light packs and building lighting. With warehousing uses, I'd be very concerned about how they light their parking areas in regards to buildings that are adjacent to residential areas and certainly would want to see a zero fall at those lines with no glare issues being a problem for the residents as well, for all residential uses. I didn't hear a comment in regards to it, but I think that there needs to be consideration in the planning that the land in transition and undeveloped land that the developer is impacting, through this development, that those areas that are basically rough graded or in rough grade, that they be placed in a maintained condition. We've had situations over the years in the City of Springdale where developments have started their process - stripped that land and not built out, due to bankruptcy or whatever and we've ended up with a terrible situation and terrible blight on the community with those developments. I'd certainly want to make sure that we protect that; I've made several comments in regards to, I think staff comments, in regards to sidewalks on both sides of the road; I think they're necessary. I think walking paths are important; they're a big part of our community. We're talking a good number of jobs that are proposed to be developed in this area, so certainly getting those walking paths an opportunity to work would be necessary and dual-sided sidewalks are necessary for that to be functional. Bill, I think your comment in regard to the ISR numbers needs to really be considered based upon these build-out numbers. When they show future storage areas or future building, and I think staff will, in regards to that. I was a little bit concerned that those numbers weren't reflective in those percentages of green space that we were getting on this initial. Don, in regards to street "C", with the cul-de-sac that goes back to the residents, I have concerns regarding the ability for a tractor trailer that inadvertently goes down that street due to confusion and can't go out and wants to go through the neighborhood and find its way so we certainly need to address that in the design plan. I agree with you, Mrs. McBride, in regards to the building height adjustments, in regards to its proximity to the residential homes. We were provided by the developer a site line graph showing how the buildings react to a visual line from the single family residents in Heritage Hill. Let me point out that the drawing that they presented is a single line and when you look in front of you, you don't look in a straight line, you look wider, and as you get further away, the span or view is wider. So that person standing or sitting on their back porch doesn't necessarily see that straight line - they see a y and the further out it goes, the wider you see. Of course, the further it goes, the better. So that's a very big concern of mine. I do have a serious concern regarding Building 8 and Building 1 on Crescentville Road, in regard to its set-back. I consider that building frontage and street frontage, and therefore it needs to be addressed that way. It will be even worse on Building 8 if that lane needs to be widened out, we're going to have a much more significant issue in regards to that. Going back to the trees, I think that the Applicant does need some latitude to try to develop and lay out the tree plan for developing the site and dealing with the trees, but I think we need to give him relief if there are trees that are diseased, which we typically do if they're diseased or have ash worm. Obviously we would certainly need to be able to give the Applicant and the tree survey would identify those trees and I know that there are a good number of them that are gone. Mrs. McBride, I am concerned in regards to the comprehensive plan designation. Out of all letters up to "N", seven of them do not comply with that strategy. One of them, and I can go through it real quick - A does not, C does not, E does not, F does not, I does not, L does not, N does not. I believe that M could and B, I believe that's about a 50/50. That's my short list. I think that the Applicant has to look at this and see how some of those strategies can be dealt with in regards to that comprehensive plan that was approved. I have concerns in regards to the noise impact on the residents in regards to Building 1 and Building 2. Mounding will help but it doesn't totally eliminate noise, especially with the potential future expansion areas on Building 1, which would make that pretty difficult. I believe that might address my items, I just want to make sure.

In Item 3, in regards to your Considerations, Mrs. McBride - they currently are not, so I would not be able to include that in the motion, I guess. Or reflective of the recommendations. I couldn't support that in the motion, because currently it doesn't. I think it needs to, so should we say it needs to? In your Considerations, item #3.

Mrs. McBride: Oh, under Considerations, I'm sorry.

Mr. Okum: Yes.

Mrs. McBride: I thought you were on Item #3.

Mr. Okum: I know I've gone through a lot of things. I think it needs to say "needs to", at least get to that point. Item 3, under Considerations from Mrs. McBride. And under Item 8, should it not say "and Planning Commission's approval of the PUD Landscaping Plan?" or maybe not?

Mrs. McBride: That was set up so that the individual plans for individual sites would come back to the commission as part of the Final Development Plan but that we would need to set up specific standards for building and parking streetscapes.

Mr. Okum: But this references Zoning Code only and that concerns me.

Mrs. McBride: Because section numbers will be changing.

Mr. Okum: Okay, I understand that. Because this is a PUD, right?

Mrs. McBride: Right.

Mr. Okum: So those landscaping plans can be increased or decreased based upon the same way we deal with parking and setbacks and so forth.

Mrs. McBride: Correct.

Mr. Okum: Okay. That's pretty much all I have to say.

Chairman Darby: Before I move on to the next person, I need to, at this time, get acknowledgement from our Council persons that it is their opinion that this represents a major modification to this PUD.

(Both in agreement).

Chairman Darby: Let the record show they're both in agreement.

Mr. Bauer: Just a couple of questions. Mr. Shveg zda, on Page 2 of your report, just trying to understand the emergency access drive. The reason for that access drive is because that cul-de-sac is too long, is that correct?

Mr. Shveg zda: Yes, that is correct. I was just trying to mitigate that, providing another possible location for emergency vehicles to access it.

Mr. Bauer: And the access would be, if that were was blocked somehow, that this would give them another way to get back to those buildings in the back.

Mr. Shveg zda: Correct.

Mr. Bauer: This would be for the Applicant. As I looked at the site line cross sections, I'm a little confused as I looked at those things. The site line - is it proposed that those site lines are from the residences at the end of that line, like for number one? It crosses several residences but it ends up in one.

Mr. Dragon: Yes, the intent of the site line is as from eye level at the residence adjacent to the development and then across the buffer area at the height of buffering.

Mr. Bauer: So, I don't know if you have this in front of you; I'm looking at.

Mr. Dragon: I don't.

Mr. Bauer: Pick a number. 2 – It shows the site line going all the way across the street into the east side of whatever road that is, Ledro.

Mrs. McBride: The commission also might want to confirm what the height of the building is that's shown on there and whether or not there's any mechanical equipment shown on there as well.

Mr. Bauer: As I look at that, I'm trying to understand what I'm looking at. I'm not sure where I'm standing and seeing that site line that I see on the next page past that. Item 1, go back to overall plan of that - it's the page before that. So that view, I'm seeing as Item 1, what I'm asking is, at the very end of that line, that's where I'm standing, if I'm seeing that elevation I'm seeing?

Mr. Dragon: The line that is adjacent to Item 1 is the cross section that you're looking at, so you're looking north at that section, at that line.

Mr. Bauer: Okay, I'm going to get up (goes to projection screen).

Applicant: (Not at podium, illegible)

Mr. Bauer: That helps, thank you. That's all I have for now.

Mrs. McBride: My question was what was the height of the buildings that were shown on those cross sections? I don't believe that they included any rooftop-mounted equipment.

Mrs. Boice: They didn't; they're not putting anything.

Mrs. McBride: But I don't believe they were 48 feet in my height; they weren't the maximum building height, I don't believe, on the cross section.

Mr. Dragon: They were approximately 40 feet as shown.

Mrs. Harlow: I had a question for Mrs. McBride, on her report, on page 5, item 6, talking about loading spaces that could not be visible from the street frontage. It goes on to say the applicant is proposing to allow them to front on a street with four feet of screening and adjacent to residential property without screening. I don't feel like that that's going to fly either.

Mrs. McBride: That's actually contained in their covenants.

Mr. Dragon: If I may, just to address that specific item - we'd be willing to change our covenants to change that provision to not allow those loading areas along the streets in the residential areas. We can change the language to clear that up.

Mrs. Harlow: Okay, thank you. Then I think I had some questions about Building 1. You've got your future expansion that is proposed and then there's an outdoor storage yard and then a future storage yard. Are those going to be developed immediately? Are they like a Phase I, or Phase II? Will there be any green space there before they are developed?

Mr. Dragon: The expansion area is not planned for immediate development. It would be for future expansion if that tenant chooses to expand.

Mrs. Harlow: What about the outdoor storage yards and the future storage yards?

Mr. Dragon: The outdoor yard, the area that is shown as proposed, would be constructed with the initial phase. The future yard would be constructed with the future expansion.

Mrs. Harlow: And we have no idea at this time what might be stored in those outdoor storage areas? Is it going to be like tractor trailers, is it going to be railroad containers, what is it going to be?

Mr. Dragon: The tenant we're working with currently is a plumbing supplier. They supply pipe and plumbing fittings. It would be those kind of materials that would be stored in that yard.

Mrs. Harlow: Is this outdoor storage area going to be fenced in, secured?

Mr. Dragon: Yes.

Mrs. Harlow: So I'm going to assume that's going to be a very high fence?

Mr. Dragon: I believe an 8' fence is what they've proposed.

Mrs. Harlow: Is that going to be chain link?

Mr. Dragon: It is, with slats.

Mrs. Harlow: With some type of security over the top of it to prevent people from being able to access the inside of the storage area?

Mr. Dragon: I don't have more detail on the fence at this time. It would obviously be coming through with the Final Development Plan.

Mrs. Harlow: I think my final concern is, we don't have the Traffic Study back yet, but I am very concerned about Crescentville Road, where that lane stops. I was driving over there at 8:15 p.m. last night and the sun was setting in the west and it had just rained so the pavement was dark in the front and the sun was glaring off all the mirrors to the point where you could not see visually anything that was coming up. I was in the right hand lane; you couldn't see anything in the left hand lane and that lane was ending; you had to get over to the main lane to continue through the light there. I thought it was quite dangerous. So I'm worried about that lane and also worried about the residents' access for egress in getting back into the complex there on 747.

Mr. Dragon: Just so I'm clear - were you talking about the lane on Crescentville that's east-bound?

Mrs. Harlow: Yes.

Mr. Dragon: The intent would be, and we have sort of agreed, that we would extend that lane to be a right-turn lane into the project. If additional signage or warning is warranted that that lane is ending, or pavement markings, I'm sure we can work with you.

Mrs. Harlow: I guess I had never been over there at that time of the night when the sun was setting and it was absolutely blinding you from the back.

Mr. Dragon: Yes, I can imagine that. It's difficult going in that direction.

Mrs. Harlow: So I think that the longer that lane is, the better off that the drivers would be.

Mrs. Boice: My fellow members have covered a lot of points here. There's one point that you're going to see me take a very hard line on; it's the setbacks. I am really concerned when you see a setback, I don't care where it is - whether it's someplace where it's not near homes or that type of thing, but we have a code for a reason. When a setback drops from 100 feet to 25 feet, I'm not comfortable with that so I'm going to be upfront and to the point - I'm going to hold the line on that and I just wanted to let you know.

Mr. Bauer: Another question. We talked about roof elevations to the buildings - I see a finished floor elevation on some of these buildings. Do you have the elevations of the buildings, like 1, 2, along Heritage Hill, 5? The elevation of the building?

Mr. Dragon: The floor elevation?

Mr. Bauer: You have a finished floor on the drawing. So what is the roof elevation then?

Mr. Dragon: We don't have detailed plans; we have a preliminary grading plan that's based on that finished floor elevation. The sight line drawings are shown at approximately 40, I believe, possibly 42 feet in total height.

Mr. Bauer: So all those along there you anticipate those to be 42 feet roughly?

Mr. Dragon: Yes, with those buildings, Buildings 1 and 2, what we'd anticipate is a 32' clear height building which by the time you look at the structural steel above that clear height elevation, you look at roof pitch, you look at what you need to install to screen rooftop units; you're looking probably minimally at 40-42 feet high, possibly going a little higher at the corners to sort of signal an entry point, that sort of thing, which is where you'd get up into the possibly 48' elevation.

Mr. Bauer: Another question. During construction, what is your proposal for the residents in the condominiums, to get in and out?

Mr. Dragon: Well we developed a maintenance traffic plan that would be coordinated with the sequencing of this street construction so that there's always a manner of ingress and egress and that will be part of the final design plans. We'd have a maintenance traffic plan that we'd submit to the city and we'd work with the residents to coordinate that so that they're not left in a condition where they don't have a safe means of ingress and egress. It's something we can obviously commit to and something I'm sure the city would hold our feet to the fire quite closely on that issue. We've had that discussion with the condo association board in general terms. There's that issue; there's also we'll probably be reworking some of their utility services as we install new trunk utilities into the project, we'll probably be connecting them to that new system rather than what they're on. There will be those kind of coordination issues that we'll need to work through during the construction phasing, in addition to the access management.

Mr. Bauer: Okay. One last thing, the buildings down at the north end, 5, 7, and, I don't have my glasses.

Mr. Dragon: That would be the south end of the project.

Mr. Bauer: As I look at those, I echo Mr. Darby's comment about too much stuff. Those buildings, it looks like you would traverse through each other parking lot to get through to each one. Am I correct in what I'm seeing there?

Mr. Dragon: Yes and I think we noted on the plan that, those buildings in particular, if they develop that way, and again, this is a conceptual plan. We'd have to have a cross parking and access easement; they'd be developed in tandem so that they could function together and sort of share parking and access drives and that's, again, what we're proposing as part of the Final Development Plan, that we have those provisions in place. Obviously that gets into issued that Mrs. McBride spoke to earlier regarding specific parking setbacks because obviously those are difficult to achieve if you've got shared parking facilities. Again, it's conceptual; it's not an unusual circumstance to see those types of buildings share parking and access drives. It's something we think is feasible and practical to achieve; it's something that's fairly common if the city is willing to consider that as part of the Final Development Plan stage. I think it's a matter of just identifying specific rights and responsibilities and maintenance issues, those sort of things.

Mr. Bauer: Thank you.

Mr. Diehl: I have one question for you - could you tell us what the timeline is for this?

Mr. Dragon: Ideally, we would like to start construction yet this year. Once we have full zoning approvals, permits, with planned construction of Buildings 1, 2, and hopefully Building 8, beginning this year as well, with an opening of those buildings approximately a year from now.

Mr. Diehl: Buildings 1, 2, and 8, fine, but since you don't have a tenant for Buildings 3, 4, 5, 6, I assume this is subject to change going forward.

Mr. Dragon: It is.

Mr. Diehl: That's really the only question I have. If everything goes the way you would like, when would you hope to be completely finished?

Mr. Dragon: I think what we projected in terms of our development timeline, conservatively we'd be complete build-out in/around 2022, 2023. Obviously accelerating that is better.

Mr. Diehl: Right, more or less.

Mr. Dragon: Right.

Mr. Diehl: That's the only question I have. I do have some comments, though. I know we don't have the Traffic Study done yet but I just can't help thinking is it going to be a major traffic problem for us? So I would like to see that study in some detail on that and so forth. I also have a bit of a concern about the water retention. Those are my two big concerns. The only other thing, and you said about a gateway, I think that's a terrific idea and I think we should incorporate one of those. That's all my comments. Thank you.

Mrs. Harlow: I'm going to go back, and I know the Traffic Study isn't done, and when I first started looking at C-140, in my mind I thought if we could move Building 4 across the street and put it by Building 3, and then move Building 9 over, and then run our proposed Street "B" down closer to the condominiums, but then I thought no, that is going to put more traffic there for them. I guess my concern is can we get the people that our going to occupy Building 2 and Building 1, which are going to be the biggest buildings on your site, to move the tractor-trailer traffic and come in off of Crescentville Road; is there any way that you can put that into the agreement that you're working on for the people who are going to rent those buildings? I'm just trying to get the tractor-trailers as far away from the condos as we can get them.

Mr. Dragon: I understand. Obviously there are specific considerations related to the Traffic Study but I can say that my general response to that would be I don't think that's something we can feasibly do, to limit that point of access to not be available to trucks.

Mrs. Harlow: It just seems to me like that if those big rigs came around that way and came on Crescentville Road and entered that way, especially for Buildings 1 and 2, it would be better for everybody concerned. I'm going to assume that the other buildings are not going to have as much heavy traffic as 1 and 2. When you look at Crescentville Road, there's other trucking companies on Crescentville and they all use that; no, there might be one trucking company that uses part of a 747 entrance down there by Thornton's, that old roadway, Yellow Consolidated Trucking Company, they may use that. That's just a concern I think that might help a little bit if we could get that routed that way. That's all, thank you.

Mr. Okum: Just a few more items to wrap up. At this point, I'm not prepared to make a motion this evening; if someone else wishes to, I'd open the floor up to them but I'm not prepared. I think there are still a lot of answers, with the Traffic Study and so forth that need to be done. I'm encouraged by what the Applicant has submitted and I'm a little discouraged by the amount, and we spoke to this at the last meeting, I'll speak to it again – the amount of commercial warehouse that's going into the development. Specifically, Building 1 and Building 2. Building 2 seems to be mammothly large, considering you don't even know what type of business would be going in there currently. Building 3, I'm concerned in regards to that appears to be office/warehouse-type use but I'm a little confused – is it warehousing or is it not? Maybe you can help me with that because it appears on the drawing that it's designed for warehousing.

Mr. Dragon: The building, as it's laid out, is laid out to accommodate trucks and warehouse-type functions but the use is not known. We've actually primarily been talking most recently on the two 150 size buildings, 8 and 3, to more manufacturing-type users as opposed to warehouse/distribution-type users.

Mr. Okum: Just a little odd and hard to deal with an entry feature on the corner when you've got an industrial use right there as well. I mean, Dublin does it, and other communities have done it, so I'm sure we can too. I think how those buildings are handled from the street-side view versus a concrete panel that's lifted up and painted grey with a stripe on it, is a very critical issue on that corner. I'd be very concerned, specifically about Building 3, but I spoke to Building 8 and to Building 1 having frontage on Crescentville Road; that still is frontage and we would treat those buildings as those exposures, those elevations as frontage on Crescentville Road. Getting back to the item of storage, I'm still very concerned about the noise issues with Heritage Hill and the residents along Ledro. I understand the use and I understand what needs to be done, but it's up to you, the developer, to come up with attenuating results, or to resolve that. I'm also concerned in regards to the height of the storage; that needs to be in the covenants as well, that the storage can't exceed a certain height because basically you might as well be looking at a container. Thank you, Mrs. Harlow, because had you not mentioned that, my mind didn't go that way but I'm thinking Crescentville Road further down, there's stacks of containers that are five, seven-high, sitting

there on Crescentville Road. For those of you that don't drive Crescentville Road, the old Kraft building at Chesterdale and Crescentville is a good example of a building that was built directly on the public right of way with a very shallow setback and that's potentially what we could have along Crescentville Road, so you understand my feelings and why I'm expressing myself the way I am about it, because we all know what that building looks like. It's not Kraft anymore; it's another foods place, but it's still a box and it sits there on Crescentville Road. I think that's pretty much the only items that I had and I thank you for listening to me. Like I said, I'm not ready to make a motion; if someone else on the commission wishes to, that's fine but I'm not ready to vote tonight. I don't think you were expecting us to, were you?

Chairman Darby: I think with all the issues and the unanswered questions, and something as major as a Traffic Study, it would not be advisable for us to make a motion at this time. I don't know exactly what it could contain that would be good news.

Mr. Okum: Mr. Chairman, I also think that we need to give the Applicant an Opportunity to address some of the things that have been brought up by the commission and by staff in their report and give them an opportunity to respond and give resolution.

Mr. McErlane: Mr. Chairman, I was just going to point out, if you did make a motion, it would be because of the two Council members have indicated some Major Modification would be a referral to City Council for approval of the plan, the modification.

Mr. Okum: Right, I understand that. It goes straight to Council before us. It should at least get Planning Commission look first and then get to Council. Mr. Chairman, I move to continue this to the next meeting.

(Mrs. Boice seconded the motion.)

Mrs. Harlow: Yes, I understand and I want to appreciate the Applicant's time line. I know you were apparently looking for something this evening and the fact that it does have to go on to Council. After it goes to Council, does everything have to come back through Planning? Just for final approval?

Mr. McErlane: It would typically come back phased. The first phase would come back for final plan approval by Planning Commission, with more detailed engineering.

Mrs. Harlow: I guess my question is how can we help the Applicant with their timeline, given the fact that it has to go to Council, then it has to come back through Planning again? Is it possible that, if Council approves moving forward with this and hands it back, that we could advertise for a special planning meeting, so that they don't have to wait a month, after Council has met, that maybe this would get moved forward quickly, is that possible?

Chairman Darby: If it would be necessary to expedite that, I'm sure we could accommodate that.

Mrs. Harlow: Okay, I wasn't sure how that would work.

Mr. McErlane: That would be at Planning Commission's discretion, to consider a special meeting.

Chairman Darby: Sure, of course.

Mr. McErlane: We've done it before. You want to make sure you have enough members available plus the other consideration is that the Applicant needs time to respond to those as well, and we need time to review them.

Chairman Darby: So for the record, exactly what is needed of us this evening, as far as the Council piece is concerned?

Mr. McErlane: For Council to take any action on it, Planning Commission has to recommend the Modification of the PUD to Council for approval.

Chairman Darby: So that's the motion? Okay, thank you.

Mr. Diehl: I think we're moving in the right direction here and we made a lot of progress tonight. I don't think we're ready to recommend this going to Council yet, probably when you come back again and we have more answers and less questions, then I think we'll probably be ready to recommend that to Council, but I don't think we're quite there yet. Again, I tell you, I think we're moving in the right direction.

Mr. Okum made a motion to continue to the next meeting. (Mrs. Boice seconded the motion, and with seven "aye" votes, the motion was approved.)

B. Minor Modification to PUD - Tri-County Mall - 11700 Princeton Pike - Replace 2 Mall Pylon Signs

Chairman Darby: Before we get started, I would ask for input from the Council persons, if they are in agreement that this represents a minor modification.

Mr. Diehl and Mrs. Harlow: Yes.

Chairman Darby: They are both in agreement.

Mr. Robert Rich: I'm Bob Rich and I'm the architect for Tri-County Mall. My address is at 16 E Twelfth Street in Cincinnati. My Architectural firm is A359 Partners. We are proposing to modify the PUD to add, or to modify, two entrance signs. There is currently an entrance sign on Princeton Pike, at what you would consider the main entrance, and there's also an entrance sign on Kemper Road. You may not consider that the main entrance, but it's not the entrance that is farthest to the east, but it's the entrance that is kind of midpoint, along Kemper, along the frontage of the property at the mall. The signs that are currently there just identify Tri-County Mall. The nature of retail today for the mall to redevelop itself, is that tenant prospects want identification outside the mall. There's a lot of competition obviously surrounding the mall with mostly strip and power centers that do identify their tenants out on the street and now the mall tenants want that same kind of level playing field. The new signs that we're proposing are about twice the height of the existing signs. They are much more modest in size, believe it or not, than the surrounding retail centers and I'll show you a comparison a little later on. The signage portion of the sign is approximately, just slightly over 25 feet and then there's a decorative area that signs identification of Tri-County Mall, that extends up another just shy of five feet above that. This puts the sign in its context (showing slides). We're proposing the location replaces the current location of the existing sign. So this is swapping out an existing sign for a new sign that has multi-tenant identification on it, upgrading the landscaping in those medians, and this shows the Princeton Pike sign in the context that it would have, and then this gives you a broader view; these are the two outparcels that you approved last time I came to visit you. The construction has begun on those outparcels, but in order to proceed with the leasing, the tenant prospects are requesting that they have identification outside. So you can see the sign itself is really not taller than even the outparcel buildings. We tried to limit making them larger than they needed to be. This gives you an idea of the new sign superimposed over the existing sign. This is the Princeton Pike sign and that rectangle you see above it is the entire area of the new sign. It exists in the contexts of there are our neighbors' signs. Although I wasn't able to take measurements of those existing signs, I can tell you that the signs that we are proposing are smaller than any one of those signs.

Mr. McErlane read staff comments.

Mrs. McBride: The only things that I would add to those comments is that the signs are set back ten feet from the public right-of-way, which is something that we're going to be requiring for all signs with the new Zoning Code. They did submit a landscape plan for the base of those signs and we just had some very minor comments on those.

Mr. Shvegza had no comments.

Mr. Okum: In regard to the sign, are the letters for the individual businesses going to be cut out of the aluminum? The letters are cut out versus a transparent white glass box.

Mr. Rich: They'll be internally illuminated.

Mr. Okum: Internally illuminated, cut-out, reverse.

Mr. Rich: (illegible, not at microphone)

Mr. Okum: Do we have that staff, the color palette? They submitted that?

Mr. Rich: So the sign face that you see is this material and those signs are intended to be internally illuminated. The pattern material that you see, the green pattern, that's a combination of a white with the background of a color, this color, and then that will be lit (illegible, walking away from microphone)

Mrs. Boice: May I see that palette?

Mr. Okum: Is the flower, did you say that the

Mr. Rich: The leaf.

Mr. Okum: The leaf, is the leaf going to be lit?

Mr. Rich: Yes the leaf will be lit.

Mr. Okum: And are you using LED technology on it?

Mr. Rich: It probably will be LED technology. We don't have the details developed for the illumination but that's probably the current technology, both from an energy-saving standpoint, which the mall ownership would want their electric bills to be as low as they can be, to have the sign illuminated.

Mr. Okum: Since I can't really speak to content, there are some interesting names up on that sign. Is that a sampling?

Mr. Rich: Yes, it is a sampling and I can't speak to it either.

Mr. Okum: That's fine; we'll both not speak to it.

Mr. McErlane: One of the questions I think Mr. Okum asked, on your color palette, you're showing like an aluminum composite material for the sign face, so does that mean the letters are routed out of the sign face and then pushed through?

Mr. Rich: Yes, the letters will be routed out and then internally illuminated.

Mr. McErlane: And with pushed-through type letters.

Mr. Okum: That's what I was trying to get to, the word routed out. A builder should know that, shouldn't I?

Mr. Bauer: A couple of questions. The 164 s.f., is that per sign?

Mr. Rich: Yes.

Mr. Bauer: Okay. Did you entertain, did you look at an LED sign component to this at all?

Mr. Rich: We did not.

Mr. Bauer: Reason why?

Mr. Rich: That component may exist in a future phase of the mall.

Mr. Bauer: Okay. The store signage that you have up there, is that going to be limited to what we're seeing there; you don't anticipate adding; I don't see where you would add it, but?

Mr. Rich: We currently do not anticipate adding additional panels. The number of the panels that we show there are what we want to fill. The names of the stores may change but we do not currently anticipate we would enlarge the sign and I assume if we did, we would come back to you and ask you to enlarge the sign.

Mr. Bauer: My concern, and my no vote on the previous sign that was here, I guess if you go back to that series of photos you had of other signs in Springdale – it's that one on the right-

hand side, that's visual noise. I'd pass that and I couldn't pick a sign out of there unless I stopped and actually saw, to read that sign.

Mr. Rich: I wasn't attempting to show these as good examples.

Mr. Bauer: I know. I'm just pointing out what my concern is and I do not see that in your sign as it is today and I just want to make sure that we don't continue to add on to signage. I don't anticipate that I'm going to see every store in the mall on that sign in the future. That's all I have.

Mr. Rich: My intent is to have a common background.

Mrs. Boice: We receive our packets of information on Friday and we spend the weekend, anyway, I do, going through all these papers. We've had a lot of signs come through here over the years and I have to be terribly honest, when I saw this sign, it doesn't grab, the colors, I don't know, it doesn't seem to have any pizzazz to it; is there a reason why you have gone with such an understated, after the bright red that you had previous to that?

Mr. Rich: I don't know how to answer that. My client's in the room; you realize that.

Mrs. Boice: With the redevelopment and all you're doing, I guess I just expected something more spectacular than this. My first reaction, I'm going to be deadly honest, was you've got to be kidding. I don't know; apparently the other members do not feel this way, but I was a little surprised at this choice of signage. You know Tri-County has been with us a long time and many of us hold that area near and dear and we want to see it vibrant again. I have to be honest, this does not strike me as vibrant and I hate to be so critical but I have to be deadly honest.

Mr. Rich: It's interesting for me because I do retail development around the country and I've never had a Planning Commission member tell me your sign is not pizzazz enough. Usually it's the other way around.

Mrs. Boice: Like I've said, we've seen a lot over the years but it's just an opinion.

Mr. Rich: I'll try to answer this anyway. I think we felt that stability and the future of the mall probably didn't depend on the sign. I think some of the competition around Tri-County feels that they have to depend on how vibrant their sign may be in order to attract attention to their development. I think we think that Tri-County is a fixture and people know where Tri-County Mall is, so there's no trouble finding it. In fact, I would tell you that, if it weren't for pressure from prospective retail tenants, we wouldn't be replacing the signs, to put the names of the tenants on there. The mall is perfectly happy with the signs that are there today. It's only because we have demand from prospective tenants that are saying we have to have a capability to have a sign on the street. So for that matter, I would say yes, the signs are intentionally somewhat discreet, if they can get the tenants' names on the street without trying to draw attention away from the facility itself.

Mrs. Boice: Are we going to be picking up that color scheme on the outer parcels?

Mr. Rich: Yes, there will be some of that color scheme on those.

Mrs. Boice: Well, that may change it, then. Thank you.

Chairman: As I recall, the site is consistent with the color schemes that were presented with the renderings of the outbuildings and some of the other changes you were making.

Mr. Rich: Some of that, but it will be more consistent with the redevelopment of the facades of the mall. It will appear to be a part of a fragment of the mall.

Mrs. Harlow: I like the sign. I can understand the stores wanting to have their names out there for people to see. I think it's a nice looking sign. I think it is subdued to a point that it's not shouting at you like some of those other signs are. I agree with what Mr. Bauer said; they're visually too much going on, too many colors, too many different fonts up there. You do have the different fonts for the store names but I think it's subdued enough that it's going to work and be classy.

Mr. Diehl: I hate to say this but I disagree with Mrs. Boice; I'm taking my life in my hands. I like the sign – it's simple, flashy but not overpowering. You got one vote from me. And I'll tell you, my wife would vote for you too, if you kept the sign just the way it is.

Mr. Rich: Not speaking to content.

Mr. Okum made a motion to approve Tri-County Mall, LLC's application for the two sign changes as presented with all of the conditions contained in submissions to the staff. This sign shall be based on the color palette submitted with routed letters in the aluminum panels, back-lit. (Mrs. Ghantous seconded the motion, and with seven "aye" votes, the motion was approved as indicated in the motion.)

Chairman Darby: Mrs. Boice, if it will make you happy, we will put a bunch of trees around it.

Mrs. Boice: You're being bad.

C. Development Plan - 175 Progress Place - Parking Lot Addition

Chairman Darby: Representative, please come forward.

Mr. Smith: Good evening. My name is Kevin Smith. I represent Progress Place, LLC, the owner of 175 Progress Place, the former Avon facility. We're here tonight to present to you a parking plan for adding new parking places along the south side of the building fronting 275 to accommodate future tenancy, and tonight we're here to get your comments and feedback on the plan that is presented. This parking plan shows approximately 1,000 car parking places along the south side of the former Avon facility fronting I-275, to accommodate future tenancy. This space is currently vacant, not occupied by Avon. While we don't have a specific tenant that we have a lease with for this parking, based on the type of companies that are looking at it, some of the former manufacturing spaces that we plan on converting to office space, we are finding that we require additional parking to accommodate those tenancies. I know we have not submitted a Landscaping Plan. We have some retention and detention and Civil Engineering questions that need to be answered. Tonight was really to get your feedback, your comments on the plan as it's presented, conceptually.

Mr. McErlane read staff comments.

Mrs. McBride read City Planner comments.

Mr. Shvegza read City Engineer comments.

Mr. Okum: I've got several concerns about the proposal and one of them is the main drive aisle - it has an enormous amount of vehicles backing out into it. Coming in off of Progress, if you notice pretty much the 76 spaces along the south side is pretty much going into the main drive lane, which is feeding all of the parking fields that have been drawn. It's a safety issue in my opinion, especially if people are parked in those areas and that is your main drive lane. I guess, in hindsight, I probably should have said something before, but I certainly think when you do your landscape design, there needs to be some mounding attributed for the dock area, so that you don't really see the dock area from the entrance ramp onto 275. It's really not the nicest looking thing you want to be looking at, so mounding and some evergreens plantings, to take care of some of those trees, would certainly help. Those trees that are along there are pretty bad looking right now; they may be diseased or just in terrible condition.

There was another area where, I think it was on drawing 4 of 8, it seemed a little bit ridiculous to have that line of parking right next to the truck loading zone. I know I wouldn't want to park my car, if I worked in an office, next to that huge truck loading area. That potentially has tractor-trailers and diesel fuel and everything else in that area. It is also quite a distance from the active doorways unless there's a new doorway going in on that corner of the building. The distance walked, if they're going up to the main entrance, is significant. Healthy, but significant. So I think we're trying to put parking there, or accommodate it, but sometimes just because you put it all on a site doesn't mean it's going to get used. We've got that field over at Wal-Mart's old parking lot over on another case we heard this evening, where they wanted sign – they wanted a parking lot that went out to the street, but the reality of it is, it never got used. I think at people are looking at convenience and access to a building, they don't want to walk their 10,000 steps each day just getting from their car into

their building and back to their car again. Maybe they do. I would like to see some buffering done from that ramp because it really is unsightly. Speaking of that, you're the developer that decided to clean the vegetation out along 275 there. That's hideous looking. It's terrible. You can see your building alright, but if I were looking at a development, I'd look at that and I'd say that is just ugly. I was really surprised that you did remove all of that vegetation and did nothing with recovery or restoration of the site. The state probably would say great, you got rid of the vegetation, but the rest of it is, it's just ugly. It's not on your property but I know that it had to be your development that made the removal and it's not positive to the site at all.

Mrs. Boice: My concerns are, as you have seen, if you've been here most of the evening, this Commission takes everything quite seriously and we like to work with all of our applicants, and I think that we give them a broad spectrum to work with. Almost a year to the day, we did approve a development plan on the docks, in good faith, with the condition that a landscape plan be submitted. To this date, that plan has not been submitted. So I am thinking if we approve something tonight with conditions, what guarantee are we going to have that you are going to go along with those conditions and come back and work with the city. When a year has gone by and nothing has been done, when this was passed on that condition, I have great difficulty with that because I think the city works very well with all of our businesses and our residents. We granted that in good faith and you didn't keep that faith. That's a big concern of mine.

Mr. Smith: I'd like to say our holdback on the landscaping plan has been driven by our uncertainty of what is going to happen with the vacant areas and what type of tenants is going to go into those spaces. Rather than submit a landscaping plan that we have to go to you in the future and say we're going to tear up a bunch of landscaping to add parking, the biggest issue we have with prospective tenants, and we had a Fortune 500 company that's headquartered in Cincinnati, come to the building today for the fourth time and their biggest issue is can you give us enough parking. We have an international financial institution looking at taking 100,000 s.f., 900 jobs, two shifts, but the biggest chokehold is parking. Not knowing how we're going to park this building, and not know what tenant is going to be in the building, we said let's acknowledge the requirements from the city, acknowledge the tree planting requirements, certainly appreciate that every tenant that wants to go into a building like this loves the campus feel – we want to build a walking path for them, they want to have spaces outside, they don't want to be in a traditional office environment, in a downtown environment. We need to provide a very interesting office environment for them but, first and foremost, they want their employees to be able to park. And so we felt we were going to provide the landscaping plan and the outside amenity plan after we can figure out what tenants are going in the building. There are sections of this building currently occupied by Avon (passes out handout). I'm passing out a breakdown of the facility as it was built by Avon and used by Avon. There are large areas of the building that were manufacturing processing, Avon used to call them, or currently Avon warehouse areas, that will be converted. The highest and best used is not industrial; it's office, or some sort of office component, which is obviously job-intensive, which is parking-intensive. So the biggest concern we have is how do we park this large campus building when our limitation is parking. I recognize your concerns. There's nothing worse than an office building that is not an attractive office building, and the first thing prospective tenants have when they come up and look at the building is that it has a great campus feel and we need to maintain that, and we're certainly cognizant of that.

Trees are an issue. Literally, the symbol of Avon is the oak. When they built this building and every Avon facility in the country, they'd plant a lot of oak trees. We have parking islands that have three six-inch oak trees in them that were planted in 1955. We don't want to chop down a beautiful oak tree but there are a lot of oak trees on the campus that are hard to preserve; they're located in parking islands that just can't be preserved. We recognize the city's concern and recommendation that we try to save as many as we can and we'll do that; our engineering group is working on that. Everyone loves trees and we'd love to keep as many of these large old trees as we can.

Mrs. Boice: Thank you for your explanation.

Mr. Bauer: I have a couple of questions and then I'll have some comments. The dock modifications and the like, has that helped, in your advertisement of the building and the space?

Mr. Smith: It made the largest piece of the building that was previously not usable, usable. There was not one dock in the area that was the high warehouse area.

Mr. Bauer: So it's not in that piece of the building that is now leased?

Mr. Smith: It is not. We have a couple of companies that we are in negotiations with, both of which would be great assets for Springdale, very well-known names. To be candid, we are kind of a little choosy who we take. We have several third-party logistics companies that want to use it just as a lot trucks, a lot of warehousing, in and out trucks; we're not looking for that. We are trying to find companies that want to sign long-term leases and be long-term assets on a rent roll. We could lease it tomorrow to a third-party logistics company that would sign a three-year lease and use that whole east side for trailer parking, as it's shown on that aerial photograph.

Mr. Bauer: Okay. Question for Mr. Shvegza – on the porous pavement and the maintenance agreement, that type of thing, to allow that to work, do we have anything like that in the city at the present time?

Mr. Shvegza: As far as the porous pavement?

Mr. Bauer: Yes.

Mr. Shvegza: No, this would be the first.

Mr. Bauer: Okay, I was just curious if we had something and how that maintenance agreement like that would work out, long-term. I could see issues with that, I guess, maintaining that agreement. Okay, thank you. Then the last one is on parking - your determination of the number of spaces that you came up with – 1973 versus the staff had 1800, a couple of hundred more. Is there some formula that you used to come up with that number?

Mr. Smith: We took areas that were industrial and applied usually a 1:1000 ratio, is what a traditional warehouse parking requirement is. An office ration is typically 4 or 5 per 1,000 s.f. We have tenants that are now looking at spaces where we're going to need 9 – 10 parking spaces per 1,000 s.f. There are often companies that have two shifts, dense employee counts, so I would say what is presented is probably a conservative long-term approach for parking. There are areas in here that are currently Avon warehouse that will eventually be, we hope, office.

Mr. Bauer: I will echo Mrs. Boice's comments about your not submitting a landscape plan. I understand what you're saying but to me, that's a year gone by. I'm not staff so I don't know if you notified them of your issues but that, to me, is somebody not living up to their word and I've got issues with that myself but I will hold them back in review of this. My concerns on this is storm water management, lighting, and trees, and how you're going to deal with those three issues; those are my big concerns. That's all I have.

Mr. Smith: Our goal for tonight was to have you review, for us to get feedback, address that feedback, come back to you next month with a landscape plan, with a lighting plan, and answering staffs' concerns on the engineering side as well.

Chairman Darby: So we're talking concept level here.

Mr. Smith: Correct.

Chairman Darby: I have a question. Best case scenario for you – with everything in place, all the conditions that this Commission may put on the motion, etc. - are you confident that the folks you're trying to attract will be there in such a way that this is actually what you will construct for parking?

Mr. Smith: Correct. In fact, a company today said when do you start your parking plan?

Chairman Darby: Okay.

Mr. Okum: Mr. Shvegza, there's a lot of areas here that I'm concerned about, especially the main drive aisle situation and cars backing into it. The need more green space obviously because they're going to be way too not green enough. You're going to be way down, on the

amount of green space. I'm concerned about this main drive out and I also agree with your comment in regards to the interconnect with, what is that on the west side that we don't connect with – Northwest Boulevard? It should certainly tie in to that, in my opinion. Is that public street? Is that section still private?

Mr. Shvegza: North Commerce Way would be the street that intersects out to Crescentville Road.

Mr. Okum: Isn't it Pictoria Island that's the street that comes in east-west?

Mr. McErlane: Pictoria Drive is public but that little connector is not.

Mr. Okum: Do they have cross access requirements?

Mr. McErlane: I'm not sure if there's an easement in place or not for that. I don't think we found it on a plat.

Mr. Shvegza: No, we never did locate it, exactly what kind of easement that is. For all we know, that may just be for emergency purposes right now.

Mr. Okum: It would be nice to see that interconnected – it would be good for this development; it would be good for that development, for both.

Mr. Smith: Sure.

Mr. Okum: Mostly for you I think but on the other hand, I am concerned about that – is there some way we can look at this or maybe some staff help them with their traffic engineer guy and say looking into a main drive, where all of the cars are coming in – How many cars do we have going into here, how many parking spaces?

Mr. Smith: Approximately 1,000 parking spots on the south side of the building.

Mr. Okum: So you're adding 1,000 parking spots and you've got all of those cars coming in and people backing out right into that drive aisle – that doesn't work, for me.

Mr. Smith: I think there are some circulation lanes.

Mr. Okum: No, I'm looking at your drawing and I didn't see circulation lanes. I see aisles where cars are driving, am I wrong?

Mr. Warnement: My name is Patrick Warnement. I'm a Project Manager with the Kleingers Group out of West Chester; we're doing the Civil Engineering on this project and we'll be producing the landscape plan here soon. The existing island that basically runs, when you come in from Progress Place, it would sit to your right hand side, where you see that line of trees right now, that island is preserved most of the way down. The initial set of plans that we submitted showed more drive aisles coming through that, but based on grading, we actually preserved that the further south that you go so there are very few coming in. So basically, if someone wants to leave from work, they would back into the drive aisle and go straight out that way; they wouldn't back into the drive aisle.

Mr. Okum: That's the problem; they would back into the drive aisle.

Mr. Warnement: Okay, so if there's a parking spot right here, there's an island right here (indicating on overhead), immediately next to it, and then that long driveway; they would come this way out of their parking space and out this way. Their back end of their car would not go into the drive aisle.

Mr. Okum: Those 70 spots that you showed along 275 are backing out directly into the drive aisle.

Mr. Warnement: Yes, there are some.

Mr. Okum: There's some - there's a lot! They run all of the way along that drive aisle and, if that continues along, and I'm following that as a driver, I've got those 70 spots, then I've got that whole ring road that goes from south to north; again, all those parking spaces are going directly into that same drive aisle.

Mr. Warnement: Yes.

Mr. Okum: So the 1,000 cars that I'm speaking to are basically all accessing those cars that are backing into that drive aisle are backing into a main driveway that is the service driveway of the development. Is that correct?

Mr. Warnement: Understood.

Mr. Okum: And that's not good planning. I'm sorry; that's a dangerous issue, for people driving 25, 30 mph through a parking lot - people are going to be backing out into those spaces. Not everyone has collision avoidance devices on their vehicles so that's not good. So what I'm asking is, is there a way that you can accommodate the number of parking spaces or something close and eliminate those issues.

Mr. Warnement: If we want to maintain the number of spaces that the prospective tenants need, then we would have to lose a fairly substantial number of spaces to make that happen.

Mr. Okum: Okay.

Mr. Warnement: Basically, if you enter through what will be the passenger vehicle entrance there, at the boulevard, off Progress Place, by the time you get down there, a lot of those people will be parked already and not travel through that space. The number of cars passing through there will not be the full 1,000.

Mr. Okum: Speaking to that, the majority of the parking spaces were created for High Bay Area C, on your drawing, which doesn't generate a volume of persons to work or there's not a number. Under your table, that was the lowest number of spaces needed so those spaces are really not servicing the office potential of the development.

Mr. Warnement: The office potential here in this gray area is where we're trying to get the spaces closest to, in that south portion of the building.

Mr. Okum: I understand.

Mr. Warnement: We're trying to.

Mr. Okum: It's a very narrow

Mr. Warnement: Basically, the existing parking is very far east and very far west with very little to the south.

Mr. Okum: That's about 750, 800 feet.

Mr. Warnement: Right, so we're trying to get that down to 500 +/- range to any door.

Mr. Okum: I'm just asking you to look at the safety issue.

Mr. Warnement: Sure.

Mr. Okum: of a main drive aisle in a business office development that's got all of the cars that are feeding, all the potential spaces that you've added, and you've got those people backing into that drive aisle.

Mr. Warnement: I understand your concern very much, I do.

Mr. Okum: I'm asking you to look for a solution.

Mr. Warnement: Absolutely, we can do that and we can look at reconfiguring things but to get the number of spaces, it'll be a challenge, but we will absolutely put some effort into that.

Mr. Okum: Thank you.

Mr. Diehl: I'm going to follow Mr. Okum's lead - if this is Plan A, I suggest you look for Plan B. I don't see how this can be functional.

Mr. Smith: It's a tough predicament. If you look at the gray section of the building, which is what you see from I-275, we're basically saying we'll never lease the second floor because we can't find enough parking. But if we turn that gray floor into office, it's going to be 1,000 people coming to jobs.

Mr. Diehl: I want those.

Mr. Smith: That's our predicament. That's our problem – we're trying to fit 1,000 people parking on that south side, and that's assuming that Avon doesn't give back any of their underutilized space in the future and that becomes office. The challenge that Patrick and Kleingers had put forth to them was help me park 1,000 people on the south side. If we were to get the company that looked at the space today in addition to other companies that are already looking, it could be 1,200 very easily. The pressure keeps coming and our limitation, obviously, is that land.

Mr. Diehl: Yes.

Mr. Smith: As was pointed out, we can't put any more people parking further east because then they're walking further than the 750 or 800 feet to the front door.

Mr. Diehl: Can you walk from the west side?

Mr. Smith: You can walk from the west side into Avon's side of the building, which is this area (indicating on overhead). In the future, that west parking lot would help us serve any redevelopment of that red area on the upper left side, the western Avon area. And I agree with you – someday I'd love to see access come off of Route 4, maybe whether it's through Pictoria or Northwest Boulevard. We could reorient the building so it's office on the west, office on the south.

Mr. Diehl: I wish I had a solution for you. Thank you.

Mr. McErlane: I have a question for the applicant. Is it possible that building your parking lot might be phased?

Mr. Smith: Yes.

Mr. McErlane: So there is a portion of it that you would want to get in place just to be able to market it as office and then, if there's a need for the balance of it that you would build that once you signed a lease with somebody that needs that kind of space? Because 1,000 parking spaces is way more than we typically would have for that size space per the code.

Mr. Smith: We would love to do it in phases. Certainly from a cost stand point, we would love to do it in phases and if we don't have to pave an area to keep it green, that would be great. The challenge we have is all these tenants that are looking at spaces all have a big employee parking requirement. The beauty of that large gray area is its' big open potential office space. Employers that are looking at it are like call centers, back office operations that typically have 6-9 employees per 1,000 s.f.

Mayor Webster: I'm just sitting here trying to figure this out. We have all this space, office and manufacturing, and this company is trying their darnedest to get that leased up, get that built out. If they're successful in doing that, they're not going to have enough parking spots. So if this private company is willing to roll the dice and take a chance on putting their money out there, then why do we not want to do that for them? This site is probably the third largest potential in the City of Springdale for economic development, right behind Executive Plaza I and II. If we get the right type of user coming in here for I and II, you can have those folks in here wanting the same thing – they don't have enough parking, those two buildings. They're going to want to tear up some green space, probably tear out some trees, and provide some more parking to fully lease both of those buildings. That's what he's trying to do here. I guess I'm not sure, Kevin, whether I totally understand - if you get approval from this Commission to do what you want to do here, are you going to do that right away or is that just something you can show a prospective tenant that here's what I got approval to do.

Mr. Smith: Our plan would be to start ASAP.

Mayor Webster: Okay, well then, what company is going to spend that kind of money if he doesn't have some assurances that he's got somebody to rent that space and use that parking

space. I understand the fierce competition that he's going through right now. I know there's some big users out there that are looking. Not only are they looking here; they're looking at the whole area and I know that this is one of the front runners and I think we need to do all we can to try to make that one happen and any subsequent deals that we can pull off.

Chairman Darby: I think I heard the same thing you did but what I didn't hear, and I'm not saying you heard this, I didn't hear anyone say we didn't want to do this. The only objection that have been voiced has to do with some safety issues and there was an agreement that they would look at that. Everything I heard was positive. He mentioned one particular client that had 1200 employees; we like those kinds of people. I think we're on the same page but we're trying to work through some safety issues that need to be worked out because I think even when Mr. Okum explained to the developer his issues, there was some agreement that those were some issues that need to be looked at. If there are any other objections here, I must have missed that.

Mayor Webster: Far be it for me to try to insert myself into those issues. If you guys have some issues with some prior things you've approved for him, then beat him over the head and make him do it but all I'm saying is that facility needs more parking for it to realize its' full potential.

Chairman Darby: We are all in agreement with that.

Mayor Webster: Thank you.

Mrs. Harlow: For someone who had to pay for parking for all of my career, and it just absolutely drove me nuts, whenever I would look at my paystub and see that I started out paying \$30/month at the university and when I left, I was paying over \$180/month at the university for parking - drove me crazy! So I understand that's something that companies want to be able to offer their employees is free parking; that's a perq. I would have jumped on that any day I could have. I think everybody on this board feels that we want to see all of that space utilized to the fullest - the more diversified it can be, the better for Springdale it can be. I just hope that we can have your engineering group work with the staff so that we can get as many parking spaces as we can and satisfy the green spaces that are required. I've been over to the Avon location and the way it's set up right now, I don't know if you can walk from the west side parking lot around to the 275 side - is there any access for walking there at all?

Mr. Smith: No. As part of this plan, you'll see a little loop on the bottom left-hand side - that's a proposed loop to connect the west side parking lot to the south side parking lot. One of the employee amenities that we're going to have is a walking path that would essentially walk that southern loop so employees can go out.

Mrs. Harlow: That's also another thing that a lot of companies are looking for, for their employees, would be the fitness part of it. They actually offer incentives for people who reach so many steps per day and meet certain goals per quarter and that also comes down to their insurance - that impacts some of their insurance when they do meet those health requirements. So the walking trail, I think, is something that some of the major companies might be looking at and seeing as very beneficial. I hope all this can get worked out and get worked out really soon.

Mr. Smith: Me too.

Chairman Darby: At this time, are there any other questions, comments? Anything else from staff?

Mr. Okum: Just one comment, real quick. With the grade situation there, would you consider maybe a two level area of parking?

Mr. Smith: Given the cost of constructing parking structures at about \$25,000 at a minimum per spot, you can't economically build it.

Mr. Okum: I'm thinking of the potential office space that you're going to be getting out of it.

Mr. Smith: The lease rates just can't support it.

Mr. Okum: It can't? Okay, thank you.

Mr. Smith: Thank you for your time.

D. Minor Modification to PUD - Full Throttle Karting Expansion - 11725 Commons Drive

Chairman Darby: I need input from our Council persons, that they do in fact see this as a Minor Modification.

Mr. Diehl: Yes.

Mrs. Harlow: Yes.

Chairman Darby: They are in agreement. We have kept you folks here for a long time, sorry about that. Would it help you if I say we always save the best for last?

Mr. Adler: Thank you, I appreciate that.

Chairman Darby: I use that about once a month.

Mr. Adler: I'm Steve Adler. I'm with NAI Bergman. My partner, Larry Bergman, and our crew, we manage and lease the Springdale Beltway Center, former Kroger candy factory, and also with us tonight are Aaron Banfield and Joe O'Gorman, the owners and operators of Full Throttle Indoor Karting. We're here with good news – they're doing so well they need to expand. They're in 55,000 s.f. now and want to add a second track, which is about 31,275 s.f. In your packet, there should have been a drawing that looks like this. This is the southern end of that building and they're taking a piece that's vacant over here, on the southwest corner. It does nothing to the outside of their space; it's all interior, so we're not modifying the entrance; they just need more space. What we're going to do is, with your approval, is tear down the existing wall and they're going to add a second track inside. In my application, I did two things. One was the interior expansion that we want approval for, hopefully tonight, and second, which is coming soon, hopefully next month, is we want to add a second parking lot at the corner of Commons and Commons. It looks like a wishbone. We have more than enough parking in the complex and years ago, when we were working with you on Ashley Furniture, Morris Furniture, and Sky Zone, we basically divided the parking lot at Dave & Buster's and we said no one's going to park at At Home and walk all around the corner, so we did the parking from Dave & Buster's east and south and then we had another parking going west and south. So in the portion that we attribute to this half of the building, we have more than enough parking to take on their expansion because in the notes, it tells me more parking. On the sheet that was also in your packet, it shows we have a plus of an additional 228 spaces, after we take the space we need for their expansion. The reason we want to add a parking lot, which we'll discuss hopefully next month, is just for convenience, because right now, if people drive by and that side of the building is full, the eastern side of the building, most of them are not going to go park by Dave & Buster's and walk around, they're just going to keep going. If we have parking in back, which some people will use, we feel having parking on the corner will help, if someone comes down the street, they're going to park there to go into Full Throttle or Sky Zone. It's a convenience factor which we're going to talk about next time because I submitted that in your plan, I got staff comments back, our architect/engineers are working on it. I didn't have enough to give you a full package tonight. For full disclosure, we wanted you all to know we're hopefully going to come back next month to hopefully get the parking lot approved with the landscaping plan, with the drainage plan, with the lighting plan, and additional signage. What I'm asking for tonight is for your discussion and approval that we can move forward with the 31,275 s.f. of additional space inside so we can apply for the building permits and get started on the expansion because they've got to get this thing inside, finished, so they can be ready for the fall season. So our goal is, with your approval tonight, to get a building permit started for interior work, come back next month to discuss the parking lot, then try to get that done this summer and coordinate having both the parking lot and the interior renovations done mid-fall, so in time for their Christmas season.

Mr. McErlane read staff comments.

Chairman Darby: Mr. Okum just made a comment to me and I want to acknowledge it. This is a historic moment. To our knowledge, that's your last presentation to us. (Laughter) I don't say that to be humorous, folks. It really is a sentimental moment.

Mr. Okum: Yes it is.

Chairman Darby: Thanks for everything, Bill.

Mrs. McBride read City Planner comments.

Mr. Shvegza: In response to Mr. McErlane's question about the traffic issues, we have a number of spaces within that entire development that are not fully utilized. At this point, the traffic issue is not a concern. Mr. Shvegza then read City Engineer comments.

Chairman Darby: Questions, comments?

Mr. Okum made a motion to approve Springdale Kemper Associates Full Throttle expansion to include in the motion the staff conditions and recommendations. This is in reference to the Exhibit A, PDT A-01. This motion also includes parking and site conditions conditional upon a revised parking plan being approved at the next Planning Commission meeting with conditions. (Mrs. Boice seconded the motion, and with seven "aye" votes, the motion was approved as indicated in the motion.)

Chairman Darby: Congratulations.

Mr. Adler: Mr. Chairman, can I make one personal note before I leave?

Chairman Darby: Sure.

Mr. Adler: I have been working with this Council for over 25 years now, since when it was the old Kroger candy factory and it was Larry's idea to turn the building around and make it a shopping center. In that 25 years, I've had the honor of working with a lot of Building Officials around the country because we do developments all around. With Bill retiring tonight, I just want to say that he is the most professional, most knowledgeable, most insightful Building Official I've ever worked with and it's been an honor and privilege to work with him. I'm really going to miss him. (Standing ovation)

Mr. Bergman: I'm Larry Bergman. I really just stepped up here to say hi. I wasn't expecting to be here but Bill, thank you for all the years you've worked with us. Every one of you have been great for many years. Another thing, I need to tell my girlfriend that I was actually here.

Someone: Take a picture with Bill!

VIII. DISCUSSION

Chairman Darby: Are there items coming from the Commission for discussion?

Mr. McErlane: I'd like to thank this Commission for their kind words. Even though there's a double door there, I don't know if I can get my head through it now. I appreciate the things you said tonight but it has been a pleasure working with this board. I think each of you bring your own specific talents and concerns, to the betterment of the city. You have this synergistic synergy, basically, that all comes together in the end and you do what you do for the betterment of the city so I appreciate the respect that you have given us as staff and I thank you very much.

Chairman Darby: Thank you Bill.

IX. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Chairman Darby: Moving on, you can see under the Chairman's Report, there were two approvals of signs.

- A. Wall Sign - Claro Wireless - 322 Northland Boulevard
- B. Wall Signs - Vehicare - 11550 Century Boulevard

X. ADJOURNMENT

There being nothing else from the commission, it's been moved and seconded that we adjourn. We are adjourned. The City of Springdale Planning Commission meeting concluded at 10:44 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

_____, 2015 _____
Don Darby, Chairman

_____, 2015 _____
Richard Bauer, Secretary