OXFORD PLANNING COMMISSION
Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, January 13, 2015
7:30 p.m.

Call to Order

Mr. Prytherch called the January 13, 2015 Planning Commission meeting to order.

Those members present: David Prytherch, Richard Keebler, Richard Daniels, Kate Rousmaniere, Robert Benson, Peter McCarthy, Robert Bell.
Those members excused: None.
Staff members present: Jung-Han Chen, Sam Perry, Amy Blankenship.
Staff members excused: Stephen McHugh.

Adjourn to Executive Session (Election of Officers, Appointments to Boards and Commissions)

Mr. Benson made motion to adjourn to Executive Session for discussion of the election of officers, and make appointments to Boards and Commissions. Mr. Bell seconded the motion.

Roll call:
AYE: David Prytherch, Richard Keebler, Robert Benson, Richard Daniels, Peter McCarthy, Robert Bell, Kate Rousmaniere (7)
NAY: None (0)
ABS: None (0)

Mr. McCarthy made motion to return to regular meeting. Mr. Keebler seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Mr. Keebler moved to approve the election of Mr. David Prytherch, as Chairman, Planning Commission, Mr. Richard Keebler as Vice-Chair, Planning Commission, Mr. Robert Bell as Executive Secretary, Planning Commission and Environmental Representative; and re-appoint Mr. Richard Daniels to CIC, and Mr. Robert Benson and Ms. Kate Rousmaniere to HAC. Mr. Daniels seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Approval of Minutes of the December 9, 2014 Planning Commission Meeting

Mr. Bell made motion to approve the minutes as written. Mr. Benson seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Public Comments Related to Items Not on the Agenda

There were none.

Reports from Commissions, Boards, Committees & Staff

Mr. Bell shared the Environmental Commission's 2014 accomplishments and 2015 goals, which included the storm management manual, environmental pests in our area, and shared that the Commission was taking a look at the solid waste contract coming up in two years and tier pricing.

Mr. Daniels reported on the CIC explaining that they for several years had been working on the Heritage Tech Park grant and that since there was no presentation of information that would allow them to keep the grant alive, it expired at the end of the year. Mr. Daniels continued, therefore, no activity and the property is still considered farmland.

Mr. Chen reported that a representative from the Talawanda School District hads submitted a Conditional Use application for Kramer Elementary.

Items Related to Platting
There was none.

Items Related to Zoning
Concept Review - Future Mini-Warehouse and Incubator, 801 S. Beech Street - Scott Webb

Mr. Prytherch entered records into public comment.

Mr. Prytherch announced a concept review for a mini-warehouse, incubator. Mr. Jeff Pulley, owner of the property and present for the meeting, provided an overview of the project. Mr. Pulley stated he grew up here, his father still had an office located at the site, and expressed concern about the building and keeping it nice and maintained. Mr. Pulley described Oxford Self Storage and provided a history of the property. Mr. Pulley stated the building was currently being used as a warehouse. Mr. Pulley described present concerns with an abandoned property, loss of tax revenue, etc., and the best solution to come up with was self-storage. Mr. Pulley stated he hired a consultant to design a facility to help clients with storage. Mr. Pulley stated this self-storage facility would give new life to empty buildings. Mr. Pulley stated he wants to give the building a facelift. Mr. Pulley displayed the site as it presently looked and the design they want to achieve. Mr. Pulley described the vacant property across the street from the site and wanting to turn it into a community corner with an inside courtyard display of engraved black granite pictures of Oxford historical places. Mr. Pulley displayed the design plan. Mr. Pull described to having had hired a professional self-storage management company to oversee the property thus solving the problem of having an abandoned property.

Mr. Scott Webb spoke. Mr. Webb stated that his client wanted to give the Planning Commission a preview of what would soon be coming before them. Mr. Webb stated they would pave the gravel parking lot and clean up the site. The property has two frontages and two sideyards. Mr. Webb described the setbacks. Mr. Webb described the design having internal storage. Mr. Webb also provided business incubator ideas, and stated that potential office space would be provided. Mr. Webb also discussed the zoning error for the property across the street and possibly needing a zoning map amendment to come before the Planning Commission.

Mr. Keebler agreed that zoning had to be addressed, and that the site was an eyesore. Mr. Keebler inquired about sprinkler needs, and stated that greenspace, lot coverage and water runoff requirements were also concerning to him. Mr. Keebler stated that a storage facility was a community need. Mr. Keebler felt that design-wise it looked great.

Mr. Bell expressed concern with stormwater and lot coverage and inquired about the 100 foot brick wall shown across the front of the design that was an issue for him, and that he didn't want to see just a flat wall. Mr. McCarthy agreed that this was a big improvement for the general area. Mr. Prytherch noted that even though the project was not an unreasonable use, the neighborhood is intimate, and reminded the Applicant and Owner that the Planning Commission would look at the design through the eyes as if they were a neighbor to this. Mr. Prytherch noted that he would also look at it in an architectural way. Mr. Prytherch asked the Applicant to look at it as if a neighbor in regards to stormwater, landscaping, and functionality needs. Mr. Prytherch thanked the Applicant.

Concept Review - Future Goodwill Store, 201-203 S. Locust Street, Scott Webb

Mr. Prytherch announced a concept review for a future Goodwill store. Mr. Scott Webb, the Applicant, spoke. Mr. Webb provided a PowerPoint presentation which described an addition and adaptive reuse of the former bus garage and Moonshine Printing building. Mr. Webb described the existing site and structures. The building to be used as the Goodwill store will be the bus garage. The Moonshine building would be demolished. The existing building plan includes an addition. Mr. Webb stated they would provide a heavy landscape screening from the electric substation. Mr. Webb stated that the store would not serve as a

drive-through but a drop-off facility and that the current building (bus garage) was a pre-engineered building that Goodwill would utilize; however, would add some decorative façade to it. Mr. Webb described the entrances to the building. Mr. Webb noted that the location of the addition was the best place for it. Mr. Webb described the setbacks, and noted that the design showed 42 parking spaces. In regards to having a dumpster, Goodwill doesn't use them as everything coming into the store is placed in trucks. Mr. Webb stated that the design included bike racks for alternative transportation. Mr. Webb stated that Goodwill owned the lot.

Ms. Rousmaniere stated she disliked the loading dock facing Locust Street. Mr. Webb stated that the loading dock would be recessed and landscaped. Mr. Webb also shared that you would not be seeing big semi-tractor trailers, but 28 and 32-foot trucks. It was inquired if people could drop off afterhours and expressed their concern for piling up of items o
n the site. The Goodwill representative present for the meeting stated that their trucks go around to all their sites all night long to pick up possible dumped items and that should it become a problem here that they would come before the Planning Commission to install a gate. Mr. Keebler expressed hope for work on sidewalk access and suggested getting in touch with Duke Energy and working with them to install a sidewalk on all three street fronts. Mr. Daniels stated he hoped the entire corner could be cleaned up with this opportunity for improvement. Mr. Prytherch asked the Applicant to visualize the foot traffic in their design. Mr. Prytherch stated he did not like the drop off location facing Locust Street. Mr. Benson stated he had never seen a drop off facility facing the front and expressed his concern of dumping. Mr. McCarthy inquired if the loading dock could be located in the elbow of the L-shape design. Mr. Webb stated that they had the advantage of existing grading with the current drawing.

Mr. Prytherch thanked Mr. Webb.

PC-2015-01 PLANNED DEVELOPMENT a combined Preliminary and Final Planned Development to Bishop Square (commercial portion of the approved planned development of former Wal-Mart site redevelopment project) 1.9 acres, **Robert Fiorita, Applicant**

Mr. Keebler made motion to enter into Public Hearing PC-2015-01. Mr. Daniels seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Mr. Chen provided an overview. Mr. Chen stated the Applicant wished to divide one commercial lot into three. Mr. Chen reminded the Planning Commission that in 2013 Ordinance #3221 it stipulated that the development was required to consolidate 12 parcels into a maximum of three lots. Mr. Chen provided a PowerPoint of the existing lot configurations: Lot 3813 being the Lane Library, and Lot 3812 is for review tonight. The Lane Library lot would not change. Lot 3812 would be divided into three lots. Mr. Chen stated the division would create a problem with one lot as it will not have any street frontage, but have an internal road. Mr. Chen proposed two options: Require that all three lots have street frontage or approve the lot split as presented with one lot being without street frontage. Mr. Chen explained that in order to create a lot you have to have street frontage, as the City requires it because of utilities and safety issues. Mr. Chen stated they have cross use easements between all of the uses; however, financing is difficult without having separate lots. Mr. Chen described staff conditions for both staff recommendations.

Mr. Fiorita, the Applicant, spoke. Mr. Fiorita stated that the lot described with no street frontage was the one currently under construction. Mr. Fiorita described the conditions set when the Planned Development was approved and that they did not know prior to the PUD approval of financing becoming a problem. Mr. Fiorita described why the Library lot had to be split out initially. Mr. Fiorita described the easement wall along the neighboring property.

Mr. Keebler stated that the initial approval by the Planning Commission assured that all of the commercial portions of the Planned Development would be owned by one firm and inquired that now with a lot split how would the Planning Commission be assured that the lots would continue being managed by one firm. Mr.

Prytherch stated he was worried about long-term severability. Mr. Fiorita stated that part of the lease agreement is that all commercial structures including the Library would share the cost of maintaining the site; the PUD is recorded.

Mr. Keebler made motion to close Public Hearing. Mr. Benson seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Mr. Rousmaniere inquired what restrictions the City could make on the lots in terms of design. Mr. Keebler stated that the Planning Commission already made them during the PUD approval. Mr. Keebler continued that the original ordinance would need to be amended to reflect this change but all the conditions would stand. The Planning Commission discussed the ordinance for this PUD. Mr. Keebler described the need to make sure we have good easements that are reflected in the new deeds describing access onto the lots. These would be private easements. Ms. Blankenship, City Legal Counsel read aloud sections of the recorded Easement Agreement included in the agenda packet.

Mr. McCarthy called the question.

Mr. Keebler made motion to approve PC-2015-01 with the following conditions: that, the developer shall provide an as-built drawing to the City Engineer and that the deed is reviewed and approved by the City Law Director and Zoning Administrator to assure perpetuity, and that Ordinance #3221, adopted on June 18, 2013 approving the Final Planned Development, shall be revised by Oxford City Council to reflect the change and Oxford Legal Counsel will review the easement to ensure that the lot split will not affect the access easement.

Mr. Prytherch reminded Mr. Fiorita that the tenants will still need to meet the approved design and conditions described in City Council Ordinance 3221 as far as the look and function. Mr. Fiorita stated that per the lease agreement all commercial structures including the Library would share the cost of maintaining the site.

AYE: Mr. Daniels, Mr. Bell, Mr. Keebler, Mr. Benson, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Prytherch (7)
NAY: None (0)
ABS: None (0)

PC-2014-20 ZONING CODE TEXT AMENDMENT, to revise all sections of Chapter 1149, Vehicle Management, regarding site development requirements for parking areas: minimum and maximum numbers of vehicular spaces, bicycle spaces, parking lot design and layout, pedestrian safety and storm water management. Additionally the related Section 1147 Conditional Uses, a new provision for off-site, joint-use and shared Parking arrangements City of Oxford, Applicant (Tabled)

Mr. Keebler made motion to enter into Public Hearing PC-2014-20. Mr. Benson seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Mr. Perry provided a history of the re-writing of Chapter 1149, Vehicle Management and Chapter 1147, Section 1147.03 Conditional Uses, Specific Regulations. Mr. Perry summarized all of the meetings and work sessions that took place during the past year. Mr. Perry shared who participated in those discussions. Mr. Perry discussed the subcommittee that was formed to amend the code and their working with the Oxford Parking and Transportation Advisory Board. Mr. Perry stated that the amendments outline more than just vehicular movement, as it included pedestrian movement, parking lot design and alternative transportation. Mr. Perry described the rationale for the changes made.

Mr. Perry stated that the amendments were consistent with the topics under the Land Use Section of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Perry summarized the changes:
Parking maximums, excluding 1, 2, and 3 family residential

Reduction in stall quantities, size, new details on dimensional requirements
New provisions for compact stalls, motorcycle and bicycle parking
Elimination of parking lot alternate design plan and replacement with conditional uses for parking reduction, off-site parking and shared use parking
Merging of land use categories in the Parking section of code
New environmental provisions facilitating storm water quality management and breaking up larger expanses of asphalt

Mr. Perry provided a sample of a reduction at the Wal-Mart site with a reduction by 1/3 of asphalt in the current regulations

Mr. Perry noted that the Conditional Use process would be required for shared parking.

Mr. Perry referred to the earlier work session this evening and everyone agreed that there were more changes that needed to take place.

Mr. Prytherch asked for public comment. Mr. Scott Webb stated that he would like to see some examples. Mr. Webb stated he had an issue with the code requiring a tree for every seven parking spaces.

Mr. Benson made motion to close Public Hearing. Mr. Bell seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Mr. Keebler made motion to approve PC-2014-20. Mr. Benson seconded the motion.

Discussion continued.

Mr. Keebler stated he felt there needed more work. Mr. Webb stated that he would like to see a practical application in (for example the Kroger development) or even a smaller development and apply this to it so we could better understand the process. Mr. Webb stated he would like to see the code applied to an existing development.

Mr. Bell shared his thoughts. A dedicated raised pedestrian walkway from Public Right-of-Way to the use, but consider the size of the parking area. In reference to the number of trees requirement, could there be provisions. Mr. Prytherch stated he wanted to see more parking lot design be sufficient to sustain the trees.

Mr. Keebler made motion to Table PC-2014-20 Mr. McCarthy seconded the motion. All were in favor.

New Business

Area Plan for the South Side of Oxford

Mr. Chen spoke. Mr. Chen provided an overview, stating that in 2011 a group of citizens along with a group of Wilks Scholars collaborated to consider a plan for sustainable development as envisioned by many Oxford residents, including conservation development and the visions of Oxford Township and the City of Oxford. The Plan they developed provided additional documents that the 2008 Comprehensive Plan did not completely elaborate upon. The document was named "Shaping Our Sustainable Community, An Area Plan for the South Side of Oxford".

Mr. Chen described the vision, goals and objectives of the plan, which included maintaining and enhancing inter-jurisdictional coordination, farmland and natural areas' conservation, and creating connectivity through multi-modal networks.

Mr. Chen recommended that the Planning Commission accept this document as part of the Comprehensive Plan and forward on to the City Council as a reference document for future planning.

Mr. Chen described the boundaries of the southside of Oxford.

Mr. McCarthy referred to the map included in the agenda which identified areas marked as conservation development, agricultural preservation, primary and secondary conservation, mixed uses, restricted uses. Mr. McCarthy inquired if the map would be used as a guideline. Mr. Chen responded yes.

Mr. McCarthy inquired if the plan would affect property values. Mr. Chen stated no. Mr. Bell referred to recent discussions the Commission has had about proposed developments and inquired if this document would be of benefit for future Planning Commission decision making.

Mr. Webb stated that he was a participant in the workshop for this document and that he was concerned it would infringe in underlying zoning and property rights.

Discussion took place regarding what to do with this document; was our current Comprehensive Plan adequate for this area; can the Planning Commission recommend this as a guidance document; should we get more public input?

Ms. Rousmaniere inquired that if the Planning Commission approves this plan and places it in the Comprehensive Plan would it be understood that not everything in this document will happen. Ms. Rousmaniere stated that she had recently been reaching out and asking for community input of their vision for the south side. Mr. Keebler stated he didn't like labeling properties. Ms. Rousmaniere disagreed. Mr. Bell stated he wanted more discussion. Mr. McCarthy stated he was concerned about the crossing over into township lands. Mr. Keebler stated he felt it would be a positive thing to affect the area outside of the City's borders.

Mr. Prytherch inquired if the Planning Commission should have a meeting with Oxford Township. Mr. Keebler felt it better to leave alone and not include the map. Mr. Chen spoke stating that he felt this to be a good stepping stone, and that we could adopt our goals and vision without labeling things that could potentially get us into trouble. Mr. Prytherch inquired if the map should be more broadly drawn and include Townships in discussions. Mr. Daniels stated he agreed with Mr. Bell that the written goals were acceptable information but not the drawings.

Ms. Rousmaniere inquired if the Planning Commission were all in agreement with the vision and goals that were included in the agenda packet. Mr. Benson felt that the Commission didn't disagree with the vision and goals, but had a problem with the drawings.

Mr. Chen stated that the vision and goals would provide a good starting point. All agreed that the outlined items in the agenda packet, however, not the map, is what they wanted to have adopted as a reference document.

Ms. Rousmaniere made motion to adopt as a reference document an addendum to the Comprehensive plan to include pages 111-115 in the Planning Commission agenda packet, for the Area Plan South Side of Oxford. Mr. Daniels seconded the motion. All were in favor. No opposition.

Other Business

There was none.

Items Under Consideration for Future Discussion - Commercial District Diversification * Neighborhood compatible commercial districts * Commercial core: walkability and mixture of uses - Off-Street Parking

Standards * Parking requirements * Sustainable design standards

Adjournment

Mr. Benson made motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. McCarthy seconded the motion. All were in favor. The meeting adjourned at 10:15 p.m.