**VILLAGE OF EVENDALE**

**PLANNING COMMISSION**

Minutes from the June 16, 2020 Regular Meeting

Evendale Municipal Building, 10500 Reading Road

The regularly scheduled meeting of the Evendale Planning Commission (EPC) was called to order by Chairman Chris Patterson at 6:00pm. In attendance were EPC members Councilmember Beth McDaniel and Jannelle Moore. Supporting the EPC were Timothy Burke (Village Solicitor), Ralph Terbrueggen (Architectural Review Staff), Patrick Quinn (Architectural Review Staff), David Elmer (Director of Administrative Services), James Jeffers (Service Director), and Andrew Rodney (Building, Planning, & Zoning Manager). Due to COVID-19 concerns, EPC Member Catherine Bennett attended via telephone conference call. Member John Richey entered the proceedings at 6:32pm.

Those present recited The Pledge of Allegiance to the United States of America.

**Old Business:**

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

Dustin Bailey of Miller-Valentine, representing Kinetic Vision, presented the proposed Landscape Plan, noting enhanced landscaping at the employee entrance and his belief that the plan as proposed met the Village’s landscape requirements. Mr. Bailey stated his awareness of the five staff recommendations listed in the Staff Report. In response to those recommendations, Mr. Bailey referenced the proposed tree plantings along the north building wall and acknowledged a lack of detail for plantings around the proposed retention pond. He stated Miller-Valentine was working with Kinetic Vision to finalize this portion of the plan and was not prepared to present it at this time. Mr. Bailey stated the current plan solely addresses the minimum landscape requirements as expressed in the zoning code.

Mr. Jeffers noted the presence of a 15-foot utility easement along the future AeroHub Boulevard.

Mr. Bailey continued by noting Staff recommendations for plantings along AeroHub Boulevard. He stated concern with creating conflicts with any plantings proposed as part of the road construction. Mr. Bailey noted some areas of the site landscaping would be irrigated, while non-irrigated islands would be planted with drought-resistant plantings and gator bags for trees.

Mr. Rodney summarized the Staff Report, noting general support of the plan but including the following recommendations:

1. Landscaping along the north façade of the building should be enhanced to provide a dense, variable, and all-season screen along the north building wall. Due the location of the proposed lab space on the north side of the building, enhancements to the building exterior are limited. It is expected that landscaping be used to help screen this façade in lieu of additional architectural treatments to the building exterior.
2. There is a general lack of landscaping surrounding the proposed retention pond at the building entrance. Staff recommends landscaping be installed around this feature to enhance its appearance.
3. The proposed landscaping along the street frontage is relatively sparse. Given the importance of AeroHub Boulevard as the primary entrance into the development, it is vital that landscaping compliment the built environment along the street frontage to provide a quality aesthetic. In the near future, it will be recommended that Planning Commission and Village Council adopt an ordinance designating AeroHub Boulevard as a Thoroughfare, thus triggering enhanced landscaping requirements. In the interim, Staff recommends the Thoroughfare Buffer Landscape requirements outlined in 1260.04(b)(1) be adopted for the Kinetic Vision frontage to maintain consistency assuming adjacent sites are developed under the amended Thoroughfare regulations. Under such a requirement, the street frontage would be planted with two (2) canopy trees and 20 shrubs each 100 linear feet.
4. Some proposed landscape islands lack landscaping. Staff recommends these areas be landscaped as well.
5. An irrigation system is recommended to maintain long-term plant health and vitality.

Mr. Patterson asked Mr. Jeffers if the trees along the north property line should be installed now given future development is anticipated on the lot to the north.

Mr. Jeffers replied that an overall grading plan for the site to the north will be required to blend into the Kinetic Vision site, therefore site development to the north should result in limited impact on the Kinetic Vision site.

Mr. Rodney stated the site developer to the north will be required to have a staggered landscaping pattern on their side of the property line, thus further reducing potential conflicts with plantings on the Kinetic Vision site.

Mr. Patterson asked Mr. Terbrueggen about options to break up the massing of the north building façade using landscaping, including adding additional plantings along the building base.

Mr. Terbrueggen stated his agreement there was enough room for additional plantings along the foundation of the north façade.

Mr. Patterson asked if the Applicant would be supportive of a condition to work with staff on a final landscape design for the north building façade.

Mr. Bailey responded in the positive.

Mr. Terbrueggen continued by noting the perimeter trees are all the same species and recommended a mixture of species to mitigate against future disease. He further stated the landscaping along the building south façade is sufficient to address the front entrance, but also stated a need for for landscaping around the pond perimeter.

Mr. Bailey addressed the comments by stating all appeared reasonable and could be incorporated into the plan.

Mr. Quinn asked if there was an entry canopy over the front entrance.

Mr. Bailey responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Quinn asked if the roof-top HVAC units (RTU) were to be screened.

Mr. Rodney responded the RTUs would be sufficiently screened.

Mr. Patterson proposed approving the plan and adopting recommendations #1, #2, and #3 of the Staff Report as conditions of approval to address landscaping along the north building façade, around the detention pond, and along the public street frontage, respectively.

Ms. Moore expressed support for incorporating the thoroughfare planting requirements along AeroHub Boulevard.

A motion by Ms. McDaniel was seconded by Ms. Moore to approve the Landscape Plan incorporating recommendations #1, #2, and #3 of the Staff Report as conditions of approval. There was no further discussion. The motion passed by a 4-0 vote.

1. Case EDB20-5, Site Plan Review Application: SILCO at 10200 Reading Road. *Continued from May 19, 2020 Regular Meeting.*

Pat Moore of Al Neyer and Rob Painter of RVP Engineering appeared on behalf of SILCO. Due to COVID-19 concerns, David Fraser of SILCO attended via conference call.

Mr. Patterson stated his intention to worth through what so far has been agreed upon, leaving what needs further work to the end.

Mr. Richey arrived at 6:32pm.

Mr. Rodney summarized the Staff Report, noting general support for the plan except for a few areas as noted in the recommended conditions of approval, specifically the building exterior materials and architecture and providing for ADA accessibility. The Staff Report recommended approval of the site plan subject to the following conditions:

* 1. A lot consolidation plat shall be approved in accordance with Chapter 1222 of the Evendale Code of Ordinances and recorded with Hamilton County prior to the issuance of a final Certificate of Occupancy.
  2. A Lighting Plan meeting zoning code requirements shall be subject to review and approval by the Building, Planning, & Zoning Manager.
  3. Roof-top Units (RTU) shall be screened from view from the north, west, and south property lines.
  4. An ADA-accessible pedestrian route shall be provided to the public right-of-way.
  5. ADA-accessible curb ramps shall be provided at driveway intersections along the sidewalk adjacent to Reading Road.
  6. Sidewalk connectivity shall be provided from the proposed exit door on the north façade.
  7. Proposed retaining wall material shall be of high aesthetic quality subject to review and approval by the Building, Planning, & Zoning Manager.
  8. Per Section 1260.05(a)(3)(B), interior parking lot landscape areas shall be provided every 180 linear feet throughout all parking areas.
  9. Final architectural design and exterior materials shall be subject to review and approval by the Building, Planning, & Zoning Manager.

Mr. Patterson asked Mr. Jeffers for his opinion on stormwater management and grading along the eastern portion of the development.

Mr. Jeffers responded that stormwater management and grading were sufficient at this time per adjustments based on prior staff comments.

Mr. Patterson requested a discussion regarding landscaping. He stated a desire to add landscaping along the shop portions of the west façade. Mr. Patterson asked Mr. Terbrueggen for his thoughts.

Mr. Terbrueggen responded with a variety of possible hedge row plantings in this area.

Mr. Patterson stated his second area of concern was the area east of the loading docks on the south façade for additional landscaping.

Mr. Moore requested Planning Commission consider nearby proposed landscaping to address the concerns regarding the south façade. He also expressed a willingness to relocate plantings from elsewhere on the site to add to this area.

Mr. Terbrueggen requested clarification on the proposed height of the east retaining wall.

Mr. Painter replied the wall would be approximately nine (9) feet in height at its peak.

Mr. Terbrueggen recommended plantings along the building base.

Mr. Moore stated the would be worked out at a later date with the building owner.

Mr. Patterson requested the plantings along the building base match those proposed on the exterior elevation drawings.

Mr. Moore requested Mr. Fraser provide his thoughts on plantings at the building base.

Mr. Fraser expressed agreement with adding plantings along the building base in accordance with the submitted drawings.

Mr. Terbrueggen also recommended the proposed tulip poplar trees be replaced with an alternative variety less prone to creating excessive debris.

Mr. Patterson requested the Applicant discuss changes to the building aesthetics.

Mr. Moore referenced the revised building elevations included in the Planning Commission packet, noting changes made to the design that reflect staff comments since the previous meeting. Mr. Moore noted specific changes to the building design to break up the linear massing through visual interest in materials and aesthetic features. He noted recent discussions to mimic the vertical monument on the west façade with a similar treatment on the north façade, complete with a brick inlay on all portions of the building in lieu of the original formliner proposal except for the shop portions of the west façade.

Mr. Patterson requested comment from Mr. Fraser.

Mr. Fraser thanked the Village staff for their collaboration on improving the building façade, noting signage is an important piece of their branding efforts.

Mr. Rodney stated that signage should not be an issue, noting potential use of the Variance process or a Village-initiated amendment to the zoning ordinance.

Mr. Patterson requested comment from Mr. Elmer.

Mr. Elmer stated his agreement with staff comments over the past few weeks and expressed his appreciation to SILCO for working with the Village.

Arnold Schaewe of 2988 Twilight Drive requested clarification on the location of the proposed dock doors, specifically if placement on the east façade was ever considered.

Mr. Painter responded the grading of the site needed to accommodate the building prohibited placement of the dock doors on the east façade.

Mr. Patterson stated a desire for all company vehicles to be parked in the east parking lot, as opposed to along Reading Road.

Mr. Fraser responded that the intention is to park company vehicles in the rear lot.

Ms. McDaniel requested clarification regarding vehicular access to and from Inwood Drive.

Mr. Elmer noted the desire of the Village was to shift the east drive closer to Reading Road to the extent possible to allow for a landscaped entryway into the residential portion of Inwood Drive. He noted a prior commitment from Village Council to create such a gateway feature for the residents. Mr. Elmer requested the Applicant provide sufficient room for such an improvement and to restrict related vehicular traffic from going east into the neighborhood.

Mr. Painter stated the drive could be moved an additional 4-5 feet to the west.

Mr. Jeffers stated a desire to allow as much room as possible to reduce conflict with the residential driveway across Inwood Drive.

Mr. Patterson requested clarification from Mr. Jeffers that the catch basin on the south side of Inwood Drive would not be required to be relocated.

Mr. Jeffers responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Elmer reported on a tentative cost-sharing agreement reached between SILCO and the Village to offset a portion of the cost to make the requested exterior improvements to the building.

Motion by Ms. Moore was seconded by Ms. McDaniel to approve the site plan application subject to the Staff recommended conditions, with further additions of plantings along the building base and brick inlay in-lieu-of formliner for all areas but the shop portions of the building per Sheet A3.4 of the submittal documents.

Mr. Moore requested the Planning Commission reconsider requiring formliner on the east façade.

Mr. Rodney recommended a brick return around the corner on the east façade, but stated a replacement of the formliner with concrete paneling painted to match the brick would be acceptable.

Mr. Moore stated agreement with the proposed change to the east façade.

Mr. Patterson requested an additional condition requiring relocation of the east drive further west adjacent to the catch basin.

There was no further discussion. The motion passed by a 5-0 vote.

**New Business:**

There was no New Business to discuss.

**Internal Business:**

1. Approval of the minutes for the Regular Meeting of May 19, 2020.

Motion by Mr. Richey was seconded by Ms. Moore to approve the minutes with a modification to add John McCafferty of Miller Valentine as an attendee to the meeting. There was no further discussion. The motion passed by a 5-0 vote.

1. Election of a new individual to serve as Secretary for the Planning Commission.

Motion by Ms. McDaniel was seconded by Ms. Bennett to appoint Ms. Moore as the Secretary. There was no discussion. The motion passed by a 5-0 vote.

1. Election on an individual to serve on the Community Reinvestment Area (CRA) Housing Council.

Motion by Ms. Moore was seconded by Ms. McDaniel to appoint Mr. Patterson to the CRA Housing Council. There was no discussion. The motion passed by a 5-0 vote.

1. Recognition of John Richey for his seven (7) years of service on the Planning Commission.

Mr. Patterson presented Mr. Richey with a card and gift as a token of appreciation for his service to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Richey thanked the Village for offering the opportunity to serve. He regretted having to resign due to health considerations.

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

The meeting adjourned at 7:14pm.

Minutes reviewed and approved by:

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

Chris Patterson

Chairman, Evendale Planning Commission

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

Jannelle Moore

Secretary, Evendale Planning Commission

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