**VILLAGE OF EVENDALE**

**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES**

**SEPTEMBER 17, 2019**

**EVENDALE MUNICIPAL BUILDING**

The regularly scheduled meeting of the Evendale Planning Commission (EPC) was called to order by Chairman Chris Patterson at 6:00 pm on September 17, 2019. Attending were EPC members Catherine Bennett, Beth McDaniel and John Richey. Prior to the meeting, member Jannelle Moore informed staff she would be absent from the proceedings. Supporting the EPC were Ralph Terbrueggen (ARB), Patrick Quinn (ARB), David Elmer (Director of Administrative Services), James Jeffers (Service Director), and Andrew Rodney (Building, Planning, & Zoning Manager).

Those present recited The Pledge of Allegiance.

**Old Business:**

1. PUBLIC HEARING: Conditional Use Permit for Outdoor Storage/Outdoor Display at 10400 Evendale Drive in an Industrial Truck Center zoning district. Applicant – Kevin Koch, Smart Building Supply (SBS). **Continued from August 20, 2019.**

Mr. Koch stated his reasons for requesting a coated chain-link fence in lieu of the required ornamental metal fence. Mr. Koch reported having to haul off approximately 110 truck loads of soil to achieve the necessary grading which was far more than budgeted. He reported an ornamental fence would be $22,000 to $23,000, while a similarly sized chain-link fence would be $11,000 with an additional $4,500 for vinyl coating. Mr. Koch also objected to the long-term maintenance costs of an ornamental fence.

Mr. Richey stated the reason for the decorative fence was to provide an aesthetic screening to the proposed outdoor storage area.

Mr. Koch responded his belief that a black vinyl-coated chain-link fence would provide a similar impact.

Mr. Terbrueggen joined the proceedings at 6:05pm.

Mr. Koch reiterated there were multiple unforeseen additional expenses incurred as part of the project, in addition to other exterior maintenance items on the horizon including painting the building exterior and replacing existing fence with new fence to match the proposed black vinyl-coated chain-link. Noted he runs a small business of 20 employees and the budget for the project is reflective of the size of the business.

Mr. Patterson expressed sympathy for the rising costs of construction, but noted the Village agreed to provide the land in return for a decorative fence and landscaping.

Mr. Patterson requested examples of what was being requested. Mr. Koch had no examples on hand to provide.

Mr. Patterson acknowledged the Applicant’s good intentions and desire to install a quality fence and landscaping along Evendale Drive.

Mr. Koch asked if the original intent was to provide an opaque screening. Mr. Patterson responded in the negative, stating the fence and landscaping were proposed to act as screening rather than an opaque wall.

Mr. Patterson requested input from Mr. Elmer. Mr. Elmer stated to date he has not yet received a formal proposal from the Applicant. Mr. Elmer recalled the Applicant’s representative left the August meeting with instructions to return in September with a formal plan for review.

Mr. Patterson reiterated the Village transferred the property to the Applicant in exchange for a decorative fence and landscaping.

Mr. Koch expressed concern that damage to the decorative fence will create a negative appearance and result in significant costs due to the need to replace whole ten-foot sections of fence if damaged.

Mr. Elmer requested clarification of the type of damage the Applicant was referring. Mr. Koch noted the adjacent yard would be used to store heavy materials weighing thousands of pounds that could significantly damage the fence if they were to come into contact with it. He stated fence experts recommended against an ornamental fence for that reason.

Mr. Patterson referred to Mr. Terbrueggen for his thoughts. Mr. Terbrueggen confirmed an ornamental fence would be more susceptible to damage. He further stated the existing planting plan appeared disproportionate to the length of fence proposed. Mr. Terbrueggen recommended additional plantings set a minimum of five (5) feet apart to achieve the desired screening effect over time.

Mr. Koch expressed his belief the original spacing of eight (8) feet on center was sufficient. He further stated that an industrial-strength fence would be susceptible to damage.

Mr. Quinn asked if the fence was also intended for security purposes. Mr. Koch answered in the affirmative, along with exterior security lighting.

Mr. Elmer requested clarification on the preferred fence material. Ms. McDaniel stated she would prefer a formal plan confirming to what EPC was agreeing.

Mr. Koch confirmed his preference for a black vinyl-coated chain-link fence. In response, Mr. Patterson and Mr. Elmer requested more clarification on the Applicant’s proposal, including specificity on fence material as part of a formal plan.

Mr. Koch noted the condition of existing chain-link fencing on adjacent properties along Evendale Drive. He further expressed his belief that he is being treated unfairly as compared to other nearby businesses.

Mr. Patterson asked Mr. Koch if he would prefer to return to the next EPC meeting with a more formalized plan incorporating the proposed vinyl-coated chain-link fence or would he rather move forward with the plan as approved by EPC in January, 2017. Mr. Koch stated he would get back to Staff regarding his decision.

Mr. Koch exited the proceedings at 6:25pm.

Mr. Patterson reiterated the need for plantings five (5) feet on center and tall enough to screen the fence and outdoor storage.

Mr. Quinn expressed doubt regarding the issue of potential damage. He noted the plan shows a setback of 10 feet between the fence and any materials to be stored in the yard. Mr. Quinn suggested interspersing sections of fence with sections of landscaping to reduce costs and minimize damage to the fence.

Mr. Elmer suggested a denser landscaping plan if EPC voted to permit a black vinyl-coated chain-link fence.

**Internal Business:**

1. Approval of the minutes for the August 20, 2019 meeting.

Ms. Bennett noted several misspellings of her name in the draft meeting minutes.

Motion by Mr. Richey seconded by Ms. Bennett to approve the minutes with the requested changes. There was no discussion. Motion passed by a 4-0 vote.

Motion by Mr. Richey seconded by Ms. McDaniel to adjourn the meeting. There was no discussion. The motion passed by a 4-0 vote.

The meeting adjourned at 6:31pm.

Minutes reviewed and approved by:

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Chris Patterson

Chairman, Evendale Planning Commission

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

John Richey

Secretary, Evendale Planning Commission

Minutes as prepared by Andrew E. Rodney, AICP, Building, Planning, & Zoning Manager.