

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

September 10, 2013

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: Carolyn Ghantous, Richard Bauer, Robert Diehl, Tom Vanover, Marge Boice and Don Darby. Mr. Okum arrived at 7:05 p.m.

Others Present: Greg Dale, City Planner; Don Shvegza, City Engineer; and William McErlane, Building Official

Chairman Darby: Before we begin, I would like to welcome Mr. Dale's Planning Class from the University of Cincinnati.

Mr. Greg Dale: I do have the pleasure and honor of teaching a class, Land Use Planning and Control at the University of Cincinnati. I promised them that I would bring them to a community that does things the right way, so we are happy to be here and we thank you for the hospitality. We spent some time before the meeting, Bill and Jeff did a little presentation for them so they got to hear a little bit about how things work here and how the process works. I did send them copies of the Staff reports so that they could be tracking what we are talking about.

Chairman Darby: And I want to thank them for their youthful enthusiasm in coming out tonight.

III. MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF AUGUST 13, 2013

Chairman Darby: We will accept a motion to approve the Minutes of the last meeting of August 13, 2013.

(Mrs. Boice made a motion and Mr. Diehl seconded the motion for the Minutes to be adopted as written and with a unanimous "aye" vote from the Planning Commission Members, the August 13, 2013 Planning Commission Minutes were approved.)

IV. REPORT ON COUNCIL

(No Report presented for Council at this meeting.)

V. CORRESPONDENCE

Chairman Darby: For the correspondence, in your packets you have copies of two letters to Council from this Board.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

(No Old Business presented at this meeting.)

VII. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Chairman Darby: The first item is Conditional Use Permit for parking at the Manor House at Maple Knoll Village, 11100 Springfield Pike. This is a Conditional Use Permit hearing so if there is anyone who plans to speak on this matter, would you please stand and be sworn in.

(No one from the audience indicated a desire to speak on behalf of this request.)

Ms. Susan Durham: I am Director of Environmental Services at Maple Knoll. The request was made to have the zoning redone for the Manor House parking lot and it has to do with our refinancing.

(Mr. McErlane and Mr. Dale read the Staff comments for this request.)

Mr. Diehl: Do you have a plan to do a long term review of the property, at this point?

Ms. Susan Durham: I would say yes.

Mr. McErlane: The attorney who is handling this for Maple Knoll had assured us that that would be their long term process. The other thing to Maple Knoll's advantage is currently, as it stands as residential property, the only permitted uses on the property are as a single family dwelling or a parking lot. So, if in the future they decide to expand the Coventry Court Cottages they wouldn't be able to do it unless they rezoned it anyway. It is to their benefit to rezone it to the Public Facilities Zoning.

Mr. Okum: I am sorry I was late, I was tied up with work. Based upon the information and I understand there are no comments from the audience on this, I would like to make a motion that we approve the Conditional Use request for the Maple Knoll Village property area as described in the attached exhibits.

(Mrs. Boice seconded the motion and with a unanimous "aye" vote from the Planning Commission Members the request was approved.)

- B. Chairman Darby: The next item is pump canopy color and sign change for the Shell Station at 11444 Springfield Pike.

Mr. Steve Cupito: I am Steve Cupito.

Mr. Tim Martz: And I am Tim Martz with Lykins Oil Company.

Mr. Steve Cupito: We are here this evening to get a color change on the gas canopy down there at the old Exxon that is now a Shell Station. The yellow and red does not coincide with the existing Code, I believe. We are here to ask permission to come up with some kind of a settlement or some kind of a change.

Mr. Tim Martz: I would say that the Shell customers and potential customers don't really understand that there is a difference in zoning between Route 4 and 747. I don't know if you are going to approve the yellow, but right now we have the white and red, we are replacing red with yellow and I don't think that is too much to ask considering the customers expect the canopy to look like a Shell Station and they don't understand the zoning difference.

(Mr. McErlane and Mr. Dale read the Staff comments for this request.)

Mr. Dale: My understanding is the canopy facade issue is the only change that is before you right now; is that correct?

Mr. McErlane: I think there are wraps on the pumps but that is the only color change that occurs.

Mr. Steve Cupito: Correct.

Mrs. Boice: I don't have any problem with what you are presenting. Just for curiosity, is Shell absorbing Exxon's business?

Mr. Tim Martz: There are so few Exxons in the City that it became somewhat economically difficult for them to compete with the United Dairy Farmers as a

brand. The Shell takes the Kroger Plus Card. It was a necessary thing for them to compete long term in the market, but they are not absorbing Exxon.

Mr. Bauer: Mr. McErlane, do we have any idea how close to the 10% we are over?

Mr. McErlane: I can't estimate that; we are looking at the yellow and the red as it relates to that canopy and that is a pretty decent percentage of the canopy fascia.

Mr. Bauer: One question for the applicant; what is proposed in the documentation that is before us, is it exactly what we see on the station at Kemper and Springfield Pike?

Mr. Steve Cupito: That is Shell's standard image.

Mr. Okum: I was given a packet that had a number of sheets and based upon two of those sheets it shows a light bar, that is not being requested?

Mr. Steve Cupito: We are requesting the light bar.

Mr. Tim Martz: The same thing that the other location has.

Mr. Okum: If you go to the next drawings, the following drawings show the canopy without the light bar. That made me a little confused.

Mr. Tim Martz: I don't like to talk for our sign man but he was just actually doing that to show essentially the color change.

Mr. Okum: I understand, I guess. So, you are asking for the light bar.

Mr. McErlane, in regards to the McDonald's which just recently went into the PUD at Princeton Plaza, the swish on McDonald's was considered signage, is that correct?

Mr. McErlane: No, we didn't include it as signage.

Mr. Okum: The light bars being illuminated would not be considered signage as part of a signage package?

Mr. McErlane: No.

Mr. Okum: So it is not a square footage issue?

Mr. McErlane: No.

Mr. Okum: In regards to the canopy being part of the 10%; would the canopy and the building combined be the ratio that would typically be calculated for the site, versus just the canopy on its own?

Mr. McErlane: The requirements are "per facade", so you don't take a gross square footage of the building and say it is 10% per facade.

Mr. Tim Martz: But if you did that, it would be less than 10% in my opinion.

Mr. Okum: The building and the canopy combined, that is my feeling that it is certainly under 10%. If you take the canopy on its own then we are significantly, obviously over.

Mr. Tim Martz: Correct.

Mr. Okum: I remember the stripe being a discussion at either Board of Zoning Appeals or Planning Commission some time ago and I believe at that time there was a lot of discussion about the size of the red band. I recall vividly that there was a reduction to that red band based upon the request of the applicant and discussion

that occurred. I think yellow is a lot less of a strong color in the spectrum but it is still pretty bold. You are still leaving about 12" of white; is that correct?

Mr. Steve Cupito: The yellow is 23" tall.

Mr. Okum: So you have about 12 1/2" of white?

Mr. Steve Cupito: That is correct.

Mr. Okum: So, your request is with the light bar?

Mr. Steve Cupito: Yes, sir.

Chairman Darby: Any other questions or comments?
Seeing there is no further discussion, can we have a motion?

Mr. Okum: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a motion to approve the change to the pump canopy colors and signs to the Shell Station at 11444 Springfield Pike to allow for the change in color and color band along with the approval of the red light bar as presented.

(Mr. Vanover seconded the motion and with a unanimous "aye" vote from the Planning Commission Members, the request was approved.)

- C. Chairman Darby: The next item on the agenda, Item C; Development Plan approval for Gwen Mooney Funeral Home at 11285 Princeton Pike. Would the representatives please come forward.

Ms. Erin Standen: I am with Core Resources. We will hopefully be the general contractor for this project. We are proposing to renovate the existing property at 11285 Princeton Pike into a funeral home. It was previously the old Ethan Allen space. The renovation is mostly interior and it would also include an addition of a porte cochere on the north side of the building. It would also clean up the existing detention pond on the south side of the building which is currently overgrown; we would take it back to its original intent in terms of structure and make it look better with some additional landscaping. Also I have applied for a variance because that porte cochere does encroach on the property line. The setback, I believe, is 12' per Code and the way it is currently drawn, it is approximately 4' away from the property line.

(At this time, Mr. McErlane, Mr. Dale and Mr. Shvegza read the Staff comments.)

Ms. Erin Standen: The porte cochere is designed currently to be 19' x 28'. I do have some color samples here to display. (The samples displayed stone for the base of the columns of the porte cochere and the front entry columns. Also, displayed were the main color for the building and the accent color for the building.) In terms of the signage we can confirm the sizes to make sure it is within the Code, for the wall sign.

Chairman Darby: What about the issue that was raised regarding the crematory that is not on site; it is advertising something that is at another location?

Ms. Erin Standen: Correct. They have decided that they would like to relocate the offices that are currently at the cemetery to this facility. They would also be selling the cemetery services and products from this location; that explains Spring Grove Cemetery North. They will also have memorialization products that can be designed and purchased there, as well.

Chairman Darby: But will you be relocating your crematory?

Ms. Erin Standen: No. Anybody that has any inquiries about the cemetery across the street, can come to this office and be directed to whatever plot they might be trying to find. The crematory language was an error; it should read cremation

services. Because just like the monuments, they would also sell the cremation services along with the packages for the funeral at that location. They will have the memorial service and post funeral receptions at the building, that would include those cremation services. So, that is where we feel it is appropriate to have it on this building because these services will be sold and provided there.

Chairman Darby: So you are saying that it is a function that actually takes place there?

Ms. Erin Standen: The cremation does not take place there.

Chairman Darby: But the selling of the services?

Ms. Erin Standen: The selling of the services, yes. And there was also a question about the intent of the existing monument sign and I know that we are allowed to have two ground signs per Code, as long as they are underneath 100 s.f. The one that we proposed, I believe, is 40 s.f. so since we have that additional square footage, they would like to use the space that Ethan Allen did use. (At this time, Ms. Standen distributed photos displaying the desired signage.) Once we do go in for permit and go for our official sign permit then all of the details would be worked out and it would be within Code, so we shouldn't need a variance for any of that.

Mr. Dale: Just for clarification on what you held up; would you hold that up again; the sign on the right is what you are proposing?

Ms. Erin Standen: This is the current sign that has O'Charley's and I believe the Mexican Restaurant above it. (The photo displayed the former Ethan Allen spot at the bottom of the ground sign.) This is the general design for the single sign farther down Princeton Pike (an additional photo was displayed showing the single sign).

Mr. Dale: My question had more to do with what the sign says, because that makes it look like there are actually two different businesses on site; is that what that is intending to communicate?

Ms. Erin Standen: It is all one company. It is all one service that they are providing.

Mr. Gerald Wantz: I am the Vice-President at Spring Grove Cemetery. As Erin stated, all of the offices of the cemetery, the funeral home and everything will be housed in this building. We will raze the current cemetery office, all of our sales, everything that we promote and sell as a service will be housed in that building. Therefore your question about the sign, it basically states that all of those cemetery and funeral home services are in one area and that is what we want to portray in our signage. Erin was correct, the question about the crematory, there is only one and that is housed in our funeral home on the property at the cemetery; so therefore only the services would be sold, as with most funeral homes, they sell those services but may not do them there at that site.

Chairman Darby: Is there any intention to rename Oak Hill?

Mr. Gerald Wantz: Yes, sir. If and which time when we are able to complete this and we do dedicate the new building, we will rename Oak Hill to Spring Grove North to keep the brand and everything contiguous.

Mr. Vanover: This is essentially the same operation that is in place at Spring Grove right now?

Mr. Gerald Wantz: Yes, sir.

Mr. Vanover: Do you have the additional wordage about the crematory services? I was down there earlier this year and I don't recall seeing that anyplace?

Mr. Gerald Wantz: Gwen Mooney Funeral Home, our main funeral home, it does list Gwen Mooney Funeral Home and cremation services and things of all that nature. We tried to stay consistent rather than mislead anyone in any way.

Mr. Okum: A couple of questions in regards to Ms. McBride's comments, she indicated that the parking lots need to be sealed and re-stripped consistent with requirements of 153.502 and Mr. McErlane would probably be better answering that; I have looked at the photograph of the site and I have also driven the site and the parking lot is in terrible, terrible disorder.

Ms. Erin Standen: There will be some patching done, as well; wherever we need to patch.

Mr. Okum: You have fields of grass growing in that parking lot, right now.

Ms. Erin Standen: I know.

Mr. Okum: Re-stripping and resealing doesn't necessarily eliminate that. I just want to make sure that 153.502 of our Code does require that parking lot be brought up to standard, is that correct Mr. McErlane, and that the applicant understands that?

Mr. McErlane: The 153.503(I) indicates that any owner of property used for parking areas shall maintain such areas in good condition in accordance with the property maintenance code.

Mr. Okum: Ms. McBride didn't reference that Section?

Mr. McErlane: She referenced the entire Section.

Mr. Okum: The 153.502 and 153.503(I) addresses that. And the applicant understands that would be a requirement under this site?

Ms. Erin Standen: Uh-huh.

Mr. Okum: And obviously there is a lot of work to be done on the landscaping application. There was also a comment, I believe, you made regarding the sign being reduced down to meet Code; is that correct? Are you still applying for the variance for the signage?

Ms. Erin Standen: My goal is to not have a variance for the signage and to meet the Code.

Mr. Okum: And all four elevations of the building are going to be refurbished and repainted?

Ms. Erin Standen: Yes. The same with the dumpster enclosure, as previously brought up.

Mr. Gerald Wantz: Regarding the plantings, we have brought our Staff Horticulturalist, both of them with us. If you have any questions for them as far as the particulars, they would be happy to answer any questions that you have.

Mr. Bauer: Just a few questions; what you are proposing here will be a tremendous upgrade to what is out there right now; it will be a tremendous improvement from what is there. As far as the offset from the canopy from the one property line of 4', looking at a drawing that is a little more blown up, is that 4' to the curb that is around that canopy or would it be 4' off from the column line? It looks like from the small drawing that you are 4' from the curb that is going around the canopy.

Ms. Erin Standen: The drawing that I am looking at currently, it appears to be 4' from the curb that is around the columns.

Mr. Bauer: Do you have any idea how far you are from the edge of the columns; another 3'?

Ms. Erin Standen: I did not bring a scale with me.

Mr. Bauer: That is o.k. I am scaling with my own eyes and I think that is about right. I guess my question leads to, if there is anything that can be done with that canopy as far as trying to get it off so that you wouldn't have the variance? From looking at the driving studies, it doesn't look like there would be any room to bring that back so that answers that question. The next question is on your ground mounted sign; I am a little leery about approving the ground mounted sign because there is not a lot of detail other than the sign itself. What is going to be on the sign, I don't see the structure and I guess that is pointed out by Ms. McBride's / Mr. Dale's comments; that is going to be a condition on my part to be able to approve that, to see something or to have Staff review and look at that in detail.

Mrs. Boice: I was very appreciative of this enclosure in our packet addressing some of the questions that had arisen. I don't know, maybe it is me, but I am having trouble with a funeral sign below a restaurant. If it was like a furniture store or a casket sales place or something; that is just my personal opinion.

Mr. Diehl: Well, I share your personal opinion on that but I would like to go back to your invitation on landscaping; I would like to hear what you have in mind.

Mr. David Gresley: I am the Director of Horticulture at the cemetery.

Mr. Brian Hines: Horticulture Supervisor with Spring Grove.

Mr. David Gresley: I would like to renovate the site at everything from a horticulture integrity; meaning the use of plants that fit their space and accent the architecture of the building. We pledge to use nothing that is invasive, that will fill up that detention pond with rouge seedlings again; although there is probably a good seed bank of pear in there in looking at how it is growing. I went through and struck the revisions that were asked for on this plan that I have, you do not have this but I can pass it along if need be. The plan does include the detention basin and the Market Drive behind and also Princeton Pike on the front. The plan addresses what material will be removed. The three trees that are planted along the foundation should have never been planted there in the first place; they have long outgrown their space and I am surprised that they are actually still alive. There is a Canadian Hemlock on the corner and there are two Southern Magnolias that are adjacent to the doorway, and we will be replacing that material with material that will stay within scale across the foundation of the planting and it should more than suffice the compensation needed to replace what is being removed. We would like to remove the two Bradford Pears that are along the frontage because those are probably part of the seed material that is in the detention basin. Those unfortunately should have not been planted there in the first place. The oaks are in varying conditions but we will get an arborist out there and have those pruned and cleaned up and do whatever is necessary to prolong their life since those are worthy of consideration for the landscape.

Mr. McErlane: I was going to address the distance of the porte cochere off the property line and you do need the larger drawing to make it out and it is not extremely clear on that. In essence what you see on your plan with that leader line is pointing to some dimension lines that are on the drawing that you can't make out because there is basically two arrow points back to back. That dimension is actually to the column based on the larger plan. With regard to tree removal and tree replanting, basically the only thing I can approve is what the Code requires; if their intent is to remove trees and not replant trees, then they would be back before Planning Commission for relief from that.

Mr. Brian Hines: In regards to an invasive species, what is the Code for that, do you require planting back in the same exact location or just in the overall property?

Mr. McErlane: They have to go in the overall property.

Mr. Okum: You don't have any problem with Staff approving your tree replacement species and location?

Mr. David Gresley: No

Mr. Okum: So you will meet Code?

Mr. David Gresley: Yes.

Mr. Vanover: Thank you for relieving us of those pears. I had an eye-opening experience about three years ago and this Fall as you are traversing 275 you will note all the purple leaves and probably 99.9% of those were not planted by humans; they have really just taken off and really become a problem.

Chairman Darby: At this time we are going to ask if any of the students have a question?

Mr. Robert Suttles: Some of the students are pursuing City Engineering, what exactly does the City Engineer do for the Planning Commission?

Mr. Shvegza: In my role, just like the other Staff Members here, we review the plans and prepare comments. Basically to see how they address such things as storm water management issues with the City and bring those comments to Planning Commission for their information.

Chairman Darby: Before you leave we will give you a copy of the City Engineer's report so that you can see what he does.

Mr. Okum: I would like to make a motion to approve the Gwen Mooney Funeral Home request for approval for redevelopment at 11285 Princeton Pike to include specifications and designs contained in exhibits provided on pages #1 - #9 of their submission; to include all Staff, City Engineer and City Planner recommendations with the following exceptions, Item #3 of Ms. McBride's considerations. This approval is conditional on approval by the Springdale Board of Zoning Appeals with the identified variance for a setback per Item #6 of Ms. McBride's considerations. The landscaping conditions shall be reviewed by Staff and approved by Staff. The tree preservation replacement conditions to include review and approval by Staff and shall comply with Code. All four building elevations as presented shall be repainted, as presented. The signage conditions shall meet Code and the ground mounted signs shall and their surrounding landscaping shall be reviewed and approved by Staff.

(Mrs. Boice seconded the motion and with 7 "aye" votes from the Planning Commission Members the request was approved.)

- D. Chairman Darby: The next item on the agenda is Item D; Revision to the PUD Transitional District Development Plan for Waffle House at 11520 Springfield Pike.

Mr. Walter Barineau: I am with Waffle House Restaurants out of Atlanta Georgia. Our intent today is to develop a Waffle House Restaurant at the corner of Springfield Pike and Peach Street as an out-parcel to the Springdale Towne Center. We do intend to own the out-parcel and we intend to integrate our site plan into the Towne Center site plan yet using the building to "distinctify" our brand and maintain the Waffle House at that location. We will be operating it as a company unit and developing a vacant out-parcel. We will have shared parking and we will integrate our landscaping plan into that shopping center. The lighting plan will be the same. We will be adding a dumpster corral that will match our building materials and I do have samples of the building materials that I can share with you. (Mr. Barineau passed around two samples, for the Planning Commission to examine, of the concrete material proposed for construction of the Waffle House.)

(At this time Mr. McErlane, Mr. Dale and Mr. Shvegza read the Staff comments.)

Chairman Darby: Since discussions about this project first began, I have been very excited. I sit here and try to understand how this panel is to seriously consider this proposal at this time with so many things up in the air. I am asking the Commission Members to share each of your views, questions, comments or concerns on this.

Mr. Okum: Obviously, you received a copy of these evaluations and you are prepared to answer the one hundred comments that we have from Staff?

Mr. Walter Barineau: Yes, sir.

Mr. Okum: I am not prepared to listen to one hundred answers but I am certainly encouraged by the fact that I think you want to come in and develop the site here. I think there are a lot of obstacles here, your setback issue with it right in the front door of the Towne Center and that concerns me a lot, the back end of your building is basically in the front end of their businesses and even though it is off to the side it is still impacting businesses. I have a lot of real concern about your exterior finish; those are concrete blocks that are stained and they are not masonry and they are not brick. I think that is something that we have to consider because it is not a brick.

Mr. Walter Barineau: Well, it is actually a product that is a structural brick.

Mr. Okum: It is a concrete brick, if we want to call it that.

Mr. Walter Barineau: Which one are we talking about?

Mr. Okum: That red is a concrete brick. It is certainly not what I was thinking in regards to a brick. The grey is certainly concrete material.

Mr. Walter Barineau: Right.

Mr. Okum: They are both cement materials.

Mr. Walter Barineau: They are structural, yes.

Mr. Okum: There are a lot of things but instead of going through all of that, can you give us a vision of how you can remedy the big issues of the residential roof, the big issue of setback, the big issue of compliance with that development standard, and at least give a little bit of the vision of what you see so that when you come back because I am not prepared to vote on that tonight but when you do come back we are at least knowing which direction you are going?

Mr. Walter Barineau: I think there are some things that need to be addressed that would effect how we deal with it.

Chairman Darby: Sir, let me allow the other Commission Members to have their say and then at that time, if it is appropriate that you deal with this as Mr. Okum suggested, then we would do that.

Mr. Bauer: I would echo both of your comments. There is no way I could vote on this issue tonight with the many unanswered questions that Staff feels uncomfortable with, when we get a large report like that.

Mrs. Boice: Having worked with the Commission Members here for a number of years, I know they are all very capable of multi-tasking; but this is too much multi-tasking for me.

Mr. Walter Barineau: Sure thing.

Mrs. Boice: Very difficult; I would never be able to even entertain any type of vote of this development. It would not be fair to you.

Mr. Vanover: I would echo the same thing. There are too many questions that need to be addressed that we need answers to. The thing is not to prolong it but we want to be fair with you. If it was called to vote tonight, I couldn't support it.

Chairman Darby: O.K., at this time if you would like to address the concerns especially the question asked by Mr. Okum concerning the vision, but not all of the one hundred items.

Mr. Walter Barineau: Well, let me start by saying that we don't intend to put the exhaust on the side of the building but we do intend for that to be a roof exhaust; that was a mistake that was put on the site plans. Our vision is to incorporate the site plan into that of the Towne Center to meet the landscaping requirements to share the parking and meet the parking requirements and to utilize similar landscaping. Where we need some help on that particular item is, if you notice there is a notch in the southwest corner of the site and what we have chosen to do here is to pull our building back from that notch away from Springfield Pike because we are sharing a property line on the east side with our seller, which also happens to be a shopping center and if these properties are integrally designed, it is more important for us to maintain that front setback or the setback from Springfield Pike property line than it is with our seller. Depending on the interpretation, because of the notch, there may be some room to move it forward if that is what is so desired. Does that make sense, because that is a little bit of a technical issue?

Mr. McErlane: Because the rear property line doesn't exist today, is there something magical about it that it couldn't be moved so that you would have a 15' setback off of the rear?

Mr. Walter Barineau: I don't see where there is anything magical that couldn't be accomplished since it is a PUD also.

Mr. Jeff Baumgarth: I am with the Myers Y. Cooper Company; we are the owners of the Springdale Towne Center and the sellers of the property. To answer your question, there is nothing magical about that eastern property line, in fact we don't consider it important, we find it very arbitrary because our concept is to incorporate Waffle House into the shopping center. The sale of the property is just to meet their internal corporate structure. It will always be part of the shopping center, their access is through the parking lot of the shopping center and the creation of that eastern property line is just to create the lot. It is really meaningless where that property line is.

Mr. McErlane: From a Zoning Code standpoint it is not meaningless. I expect that you intend to deed that parcel to Waffle House?

Mr. Jeff Baumgarth: We do.

Mr. McErlane: So it is a stand alone parcel. It does allow Planning Commission, from the standpoint of it being a PUD to deviate from those requirements in the Code, but it is a deeded parcel and by that fact it is intended for it to comply with the Zoning Code unless you gain relief from it.

Mr. Jeff Baumgarth: We have another parcel in the shopping center; the shopping center is made up of two parcels and that one has internal property lines that don't have landscaping buffers and setbacks off of those internal property lines. We would intend to treat this the same way.

Mr. Walter Barineau: Maybe at this point because I don't want to get off on the wrong foot and maybe it is just best to table this for thirty days. And I apologize for the lack of information and hopefully we can come back and present something that we feel is a much better interpretation of our vision so that it provides Staff with the opportunity to properly address it.

Mr. Vanover: Just as a procedure; the question was thrown out for Council if we consider this a substantial change from the PUD that is in existence right now. If it

is deemed so then it would be referred to Council, otherwise if it is not deemed so then it would be handled with this. Being one of two, my statement is that it is not a substantial change.

Mr. Diehl: I agree.

Mr. Okum: Based on the applicant's request, I move to table this to the next meeting.

(Mr. Vanover seconded the motion and with seven "aye" votes from the Planning Commission Members, the request was tabled.)

Chairman Darby: And please, please don't interpret this as any negatives because we are excited about this project; we just want to make sure that we get it right.

Mr. Walter Barineau: Sure, it sounds great. Thank you.

VIII. DISCUSSION

- A. Chairman Darby: I would like to say to the students, we have reached a point in our meeting where it is open discussion for the Members; you are very welcome to stay but if you need to leave we will understand. Thanks for coming.

Mrs. Boice: I am going to be honest with you, I about fell off of my chair when they said that you were from U.C.; you all look so young. It is just delightful to see a group of young people like you and so attentive during the whole meeting. When I look out and see your faces, I am not at all worried about America's future. We enjoyed having you.

(The Planning Commission Members and Staff had a brief discussion time with the University of Cincinnati students.)

- B. Chairman Darby: At the last meeting we had an agreement to set up a Committee.

Mr. Diehl: We agreed to set a Committee to address electronic signs.

Chairman Darby: Who volunteered for that? We need one Council person.
(Mrs. Boice, Mr. Vanover and Mr. Okum indicated that they would like to be part of the Committee to address electronic signs.)

Mr. McErlane: Ms. McBride has discussed another total revision of the Zoning Code with the City Administrator and the Mayor, starting with the sign ordinances so I will have to find out what her schedule is and when she wants to start that.

IX. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Chairman Darby: The next item on the agenda is the Chairman's Report and as you can see several signs were approved.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Okum moved to adjourn; Mr. Vanover seconded the motion and the meeting adjourned at 8:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

_____, 2013 _____
Don Darby, Chairman

_____, 2013 _____
Richard Bauer, Secretary