**VILLAGE OF EVENDALE**

**PLANNING COMMISSION**

Minutes from the May 19, 2020 Regular Meeting

Evendale Municipal Building, 10500 Reading Rd. Evendale, Ohio

The regularly scheduled meeting of the Evendale Planning Commission (EPC) was called to order by Chairman Chris Patterson at 6:00pm on May 19, 2020. Attending were EPC members Councilmember Beth McDaniel, Jannelle Moore, and John Richey. Supporting the EPC were Timothy Burke (Village Solicitor), David Elmer (Director of Administrative Services), James Jeffers (Service Director), and Andrew Rodney (Building, Planning, & Zoning Manager). EPC Member Catherine Bennett and EPC Support Staff Ralph Terbrueggen attended via telephone conference call.

Those present recited The Pledge of Allegiance.

**Old Business:**

There was no Old Business to discuss.

**New Business:**

1. Case EDB20-1, Site Plan Review Application: Signs at 2550-A Cunningham Drive.

The Applicant, Tommy Reed of Atlantic Sign Company, appeared on behalf of the tenant (Athletico). Mr. Reed summarized the application before Planning Commission, which included a request for a 35.6 square foot wall sign on the north façade of the tenant space. He noted similar signage at the Chipotle restaurant in the same strip center.

Mr. Rodney summarized the Staff Report, including a recommendation to approve the application as requested. He stated Planning Commission has special powers regarding wall signs in the Evendale Commons PUD regulations.

Motion by Mr. Richey was seconded Ms. McDaniel to approve the application as requested. There was no further discussion. The motion passed by a 5-0 vote.

1. Case EDB20-2, Subdivision Application: Lot Split at 10155 Reading Road.

Raul Rosado, representing the Formica Corporation, summarized the application, which included a lot split of 42.1 acres from the original 125.5 acre lot, leaving a remainder of 81.7 acres. Formica is requesting a lot split to facilitate sale of the property. Formica intends to sell the new lot to The Port of Greater Cincinnati Development Authority (The Port) for redevelopment.

Mr. Patterson requested that Mr. Elmer address the Planning Commission about the history and background of the request.

Mr. Elmer thanked staff, Formica, and The Port representatives for their work on the lot split. He stated the property is located in the GI, General Industrial zoning district. The original request did not include frontage along Reading Road. Mr. Elmer noted further negotiations between the parties resulted in a 150 wide corridor out to Reading Road to provide the required public street frontage. He stated the Village requested a letter from The Port acknowledging there are other requirements and regulations that must be addressed prior to any future development of the property. Mr. Elmer expressed staff’s support for the application.

Melissa Johnson representing The Port addressed the Planning Commission. She noted The Port’s interest in obtaining large tracts of land that are challenging for development, specifically sites that can accommodate end users in the advanced manufacturing sector. Ms. Johnson noted development challenges on the property were investigated, including wetlands, floodplains, and endangered species. She requested Planning Commission support for the application.

Mr. Patterson requested input from Mr. Burke on the application.

Mr. Burke stated that staff, Formica, and The Port were diligent to address the application’s deficiencies and that The Port must come forward for approvals as future development is considered and proposed.

Arnold Schaewe, 2988 Twilight Drive, requested clarification on how the 150-foot minimum lot width was achieved.

Mr. Elmer directed Mr. Schaewe to the last page of the Staff Report which included a copy of the proposed lot split showing the 150-foot corridor out to Reading Road.

Ms. Moore asked if the 150-foot corridor was envisioned as the vehicular access point to Reading Road.

Mr. Elmer responded that permanent, long-term vehicular access to the site is challenging. He noted the real estate transaction between Formica and The Port includes a three-year temporary access agreement over the existing Formica entrance bridge. Mr. Elmer stated The Port is exploring options to facilitate permanent access to the proposed lot.

Mr. Patterson noted that future development is likely along the west side of Reading Road in the vicinity of the subject property. He offered hope for collaboration on land use across properties.

Motion by Mr. Richey was seconded Ms. Bennett to recommend approval of the application as requested. There was no further discussion. The motion passed by a 5-0 vote.

After the vote, Mr. Elmer asked if the letter from The Port should accompany the motion.

Mr. Burke responded in the negative.

1. Case EDB20-3, Subdivision Application: Plat of AeroHub North, Phase I on AeroHub Boulevard.

Mr. Jeffers addressed the Planning Commission regarding the proposed Phase I subdivision of AeroHub North. He noted all of the land is owned by the Village of Evendale. Mr. Jeffers reviewed the proposed future uses of several lots, including a retention pond in Lot #1 and a sale of Lot #3 to Kinetic Vision for future development. He noted the plat would also create right-of-way for AeroHub Boulevard.

Mr. Patterson noted significant efforts of the Community Improvement Corporation and staff to finalize the plat.

Motion by Ms. Moore was seconded by Ms. McDaniel to recommend approval of the application as requested. There was no further discussion. The motion passed by a 4-0 vote, with Ms. Bennett abstaining due to conflicts of interest.

1. Case EDB20-5, Site Plan Review Application: SILCO at 10200 Reading Road.

Rob Painter, representing SILCO, appeared before the Planning Commission. Patrick Moore, representing Al. Neyer, also appeared. David Fraser, President of SILCO, was present via telephone conference call.

Mr. Moore summarized the proposed development, noting use of tilt-up concrete panels, metal panels, and glass curtain walls on the proposed building. He made note of features on the proposed building intended to break the linear massing of the building. Mr. Moore expressed the importance for the client to use the building to enhance their company branding. He further noted exterior components of the building intended to add visual texture.

Mr. Patterson requested clarification regarding the proposed location of the stone-look formliner proposed on the building.

Ms. Moore summarized the proposed location of the stone-look formliner, referencing materials in the staff report.

Michael Allaire, 3069 Inwood Drive, expressed concerns regarding the second driveway on Inwood Drive. He stated the first 100 feet of Inwood Drive is commercial, with the remainder being residential in character. Mr. Allaire stated a concern with commercial traffic intruding into the residential neighborhood.

Mr. Elmer addressed the Planning Commission, noting the Village’s ownership of the property and expressing gratitude to SILCO for their proposed investment in the community. He stated aesthetics were important given the location of the property, noting aesthetic considerations will be considered as part of the property sale. Mr. Elmer stated the Village continues to work with the Applicant regarding access onto Inwood Drive, referring to future plans for delineation between the commercial and residential portions of Inwood Drive via signage, landscaping, pavement treatments, and other measures.

Ms. McDaniel requested clarification regarding the mailing of application information to the property owners along Inwood Drive as described in the staff report.

Mr. Rodney responded that not all parts of the letter were included in the staff report due to the abundance of materials shared with the property owners. He offered to provide the full letter and associated documents to the Planning Commission at a later time.

Mr. Elmer again thanked the Applicant for their efforts to date, noting the final exterior building design is getting closer.

Mr. Patterson asked the Applicant if the direction they received from Staff regarding aesthetics was clear, noting the need to balance the needs of the end user with the community’s desire for quality aesthetics. He asked the Applicant if they understood the issues and were on-board with continuing the conversation with Staff and the Planning Commission.

Mr. Moore responded that he did not believe adding more materials will be the answer, but is open to working with Staff on the design.

Mr. Patterson requested the Applicant consider architectural treatments to distinguish between the office and shop portions of the building. He suggested the Applicant reconsider the office portion of the building, specifically emphasizing the vertical profile of the building to separate it from the hillside to the rear.

Ms. McDaniel noted the need for additional screening along the truck dock to hide that area from Reading Road.

Mr. Patterson offered to break the application into separate meetings to review individual portions of the project given the size and scope of the development.

Mr. Moore asked Mr. Fraser if he would be open to such a proposal.

Mr. Fraser responded in the affirmative.

Motion by Ms. McDaniel was seconded by Mr. Richey to table the application to the next scheduled meeting. There was no further discussion. The motion passed by a 5-0 vote.

1. Case EDB20-4, Site Plan Review Application: Kinetic Vision at AeroHub North, Phase I.

Dustin Bailey and John McCafferty of Miller-Valentine, representing Kinetic Vision, appeared before the Planning Commission. Mr. Bailey summarized the application, which includes a 50,000+ square foot office building, lab spaces, and associated parking. He stated the current Kinetic Vision facilities are spread amongst three separate buildings on Evendale Commons Drive. Mr. Bailey noted the building is comprised of tilt-up concrete panels, architectural metal panels, and window glazing. He stated that visitors would park in the small parking lot fronting the building, while employees would park in the large parking field to the west and enter into the second floor elevation employee entrance at the proposed patio area.

Mr. Elmer expressed thanks for Kinetic Vision’s proposed investment in the community. He stated the land is owned by the Village, but a purchase agreement was signed with Kinetic Vision. Mr. Elmer noted the development of the Kinetic Vision site would occur concurrently with construction of AeroHub Boulevard north of Glendale-Milford Road. The site development itself is also guided by the AeroHub Master Plan.

Mr. Rodney summarized the staff report, making note of recommended conditions to address design deficiencies.

Mr. Jeffers addressed the site engineering design, noting no significant issues and reporting approval of the Water Management and Sediment Control Plan at the May 5, 2020 Village Council meeting.

Mr. Patterson recommended that Kinetic Vision work through the issues expressed in the staff report and return to Planning Commission next month.

Mr. Bailey expressed concerns with delaying an approval given the scheduled groundbreaking in July. He requested a phased approval to allow the groundbreaking to move forward.

Mr. Elmer noted the recommended conditions address minor issues that could be resolved in short order.

Mr. Patterson stated his desire to be informed of how the issues were addressed for clarity and transparency if the application were to be approved with conditions.

Mr. Bailey stated a concern regarding proposed Condition “C” from the staff report, which would require pedestrian connectivity from the main parking lot to the primary building entrance.

Mr. Patterson recommended a modification to the proposed condition that stated pedestrian connectivity shall be required between the west parking lot and the primary employee entrance.

Motion by Ms. McDaniel was seconded by Mr. Richey to approve the application with the following conditions:

1. Proposed retaining wall material shall be of high aesthetic quality subject to review and approval by the Building, Planning, & Zoning Manager.
2. A Landscaping Plan meeting zoning code requirements shall be subject to review and approval by the Planning Commission.
3. Pedestrian connectivity shall be provided via a sidewalk between the west parking lot and the primary employee building entrance.
4. Per Section 1260.05(a)(3)(B), interior parking lot landscape areas shall be provided every 180 linear feet throughout all parking areas.
5. Final architectural design and exterior materials shall be subject to review and approval by the Building, Planning, & Zoning Manager.

There was no further discussion. The motion passed by a 4-0 vote, with Ms. Bennett abstaining due to a conflict of interest.

**Internal Business:**

1. Approval of the minutes for the Regular Meeting of February 18, 2020.

Motion by Ms. Moore was seconded by Mr. Richey to approve the minutes as submitted. There was no further discussion. The motion passed by a 5-0 vote.

Motion by Ms. Moore was seconded by Ms. McDaniel to adjourn the meeting. There was no further discussion. The motion passed by a 5-0 vote.

The meeting adjourned at 7:15pm.

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.