

OXFORD PLANNING COMMISSION

Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, March 14, 2017

7:30 p.m.

Call to Order

Those members present: David Prytherch, Robert Bell, Steve Dana, Pete McCarthy, and Edna Southard.

Those members excused: Richard Daniels, and Scott Johnston.

Staff members present: Jung-Han Chen, and Jessica Brockman.

Staff members excused: Sam Perry, and Steve McHugh.

Approval of Minutes of the January 10, 2017 Planning Commission Meeting

Mr. Dana made motion to approve the minutes as written. Ms. Southard 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. McCarthy reported for the HAPC. Mr. McCarthy stated Uptown District inventory evaluations were continuing.

Mr. Dana reported on behalf of City Council their opposition to a budget bill with the Ohio Assembly, on the collection of taxes becoming centralized rather than with municipalities and developing a response to that affect.

Mr. Bell reported the Environmental Commission having finished their review of Sensitive Areas, and having sent on to City staff for review. The next step will then be to adopt and include language in the Land Use Section in the Planned Development Section of the zoning code and an addition to the Subdivision language and working on Trees in planned development.

Ms. Southard reported on the Recreation Board and their continued work on the City pool, and a committee being formed for fundraising efforts.

Mr. Bell reported on the ground breaking ceremony for the OATS Trail Phase 1.

Mr. Prytherch reported on a joint work session with City Council on Planning work items and 2017-18 work items. Mr. Prytherch also thanked the Planning class attendance on Amtrak platform discussions. Mr. Chen thanked Miami for including City staff participation in a transportation circulation study. Mr. Prytherch touched upon the results of the study.

New Business

CONCEPT REVIEW, 6.45 acres, GB & R1MS Districts, Former Miami Valley Lumber Site & Associated Properties, Proposed Name, Gaslight Avenue at Stewart Square, Dudley Prime Properties, LLC, Owner, Scott Webb, Applicant/Agent

Mr. Prytherch reported that this discussion would not be a formal hearing, but a concept review. Goals of the development were reviewed.

Mr. Scott Webb provided a PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Webb noted the site was an abandoned lumber company.

Mr. Webb reviewed the existing parcels, which are primarily vacant. Mr. Webb continued describing the existing entrance at the intersection of S. College Avenue railroad crossing. Mr. Webb also discussed access to S. Main Street in two locations.

Mr. Web described the planned look; brownstone townhomes with a variety of facades; 88 total dwelling units and 324

total beds. There will be open space, a walking path, public park space, and connectivity throughout the entire development. The structures will have a variety of colors and details. There will be plenty of parking. Water features a shelter as well as a connection to Stewart Square. There will be three points of access to the property. 52% total lot coverage and 48% green space.

Mr. Webb noted that there were various zoning districts surrounding the property. Mr. Webb summarized that the existing zoning allowed for a total of 48 dwelling units with a maximum of 192 residents. Mr. Webb provided a comparison for a potential zoning change to R-3MS, which would change to 116 dwelling units with a maximum of 464 residents. Changing zoning to an R-2MS changes to 82 dwelling units, 328 residents.

Mr. Webb discussed connectivity. Mr. Webb discussed setbacks.

Mr. Prytherch discussed connectivity issues, lot coverage and open space issues with this project. Mr. Chen clarified that Mr. Webb would be asking for a zoning change as well. However, Mr. Webb felt that the Planning Commission has the authority to waive the GB requirements. Mr. Chen agreed that these were issues to be addressed down the road.

Mr. Webb discussed that storm water would be handled underneath streets. Mr. Webb described the existing sewer line that was not in an easement.

Ms. Southard inquired how they would address issues of safety at the site (railroad tracks). Mr. Webb responded that would be part of the application process that more work would be done to assure the site is completely safe. Ms. Southard inquired if barriers would be installed near the tracks. Ms. Southard inquired about trees installed around the tracks as she felt the street comes close to the railroad tracks. Ms. Southard inquired if it was coming close to the railroad easement. Mr. Webb noted that there was a 30' easement that the track is in the center of.

Mr. Dana inquired about the square footage of the residential units. Mr. Webb responded that he thought they were 800 square feet per level; so 2,400 per townhome. The two bedroom units would be the narrower units.

Mr. Prytherch suggested having the public speak at this time.

Mr. Mike Ramsey, and his wife Donna Ramsey, spoke stating that they owned four properties in Oxford near to this development.

Mr. Ramsey reported that 14 years ago a similar plan was proposed. Mr. Ramsey stated that this development does not belong in this area. Mr. Ramsey stated he counted 9 encroachments into the buffer zone. Mr. Ramsey described the area surrounding Stewart Square and the twists and turns, and questioned fire truck maneuvering and expressed his concern about safety. Mr. Ramsey suggested the development needed to be more of a normal apartment complex with parking off to the sides. Mr. Ramsey discussed the 20% open space requirement, his concern of the street design and closeness to the railroad tracks. Mr. Ramsey felt it will be a traffic nightmare.

Mr. Bell inquired Mr. Ramsey, if he knew how many surrounding properties were owner occupied. Mr. Ramsey responded some.

Mr. Prytherch referred to the southern units, and inquired if the City alley was vacated? Mr. Webb identified what part was vacated.

Mr. Prytherch inquired whether the zoning change should come first, and then the density would satisfy the underlying zoning (almost). Mr. Prytherch described the three points of entry, 320 students, and if that would be something to trigger a traffic analysis? Would the alley be sufficient? Mr. Webb responded that all streets would be private and would have to meet City standards.

Mr. Dana also pointed out the street design and turning radiuses. Mr. Webb assured they would be applied in this case.

Mr. Webb described the street design: the street designs are private, and not a short cut to anything.

Mr. Bell inquired what would happen if the development became R1 zoning. Mr. Webb described the R-1B zoning. Mr.

Bell felt this to be an oddly zoned area on the zoning map.

Mr. Prytherch noted that Mr. Webb was asking for a PUD and zoning change.

Discussion continued regarding zoning. Mr. McCarty stated he was okay with the R2 zoning. Discussed access from College Avenue.

Mr. Prytherch questioned Mr. Webb if the development should continue as GB, if the property could still be developed.

Discussed density.

Discussed the development's visibility. All agreed it seemed like quality housing stock, that it would have a traffic impact to the area and a traffic study was warranted.

Mr. McCarthy inquired what could be put in there as it hardly seemed attractive for families; however, he did feel they had come up with a good alternative.

Mr. Bell stated that he felt there needed to be stricter on open space and green space and assure there is quality open space.

Mr. Prytherch expressed concern about the proximity of units to the railroad tracks. Mr. Dana referred to impervious parking as a good idea.

Mr. Prytherch suggested to Mr. Webb that if they were considering a zoning change, that they would need to come into closer conformance to the other zoning requirements.

Ms. Southard stated she didn't see it easy to bike or walk through this development and asked Mr. Webb to please make clearer.

Mr. Prytherch suggested a speed calming design.

Mr. Webb stated he would have conversations with Engineering, etc. on how to clean up street questions between the preliminary and final plans.

Mr. Prytherch suggested providing a landscaping plan.

Mr. Ramsey provided a final comment to the Planning Commission that he was not against development, as this is a deadlocked piece of land. He is just against the size of it. Mr. Ramsey discussed how much money would come in from this development and that he believes it will pay for itself in 10 years with the current zoning; therefore, this is a very workable development with 192 students.

Administrative Approvals

PC-2017-01-ADM, LOT CONSOLIDATION, 200 208 E. High Street, Entire Old Lot 3010, Entire Old Lot 3011, New Lot 3887, Alpha Chapter of Beta Theta Pi House Company, Applicant 8

PC-2017-02-ADM, LOT CONSOLIDATION, 4328 Kehr Road, Old Inlot 818, Old Inlot 821, Part Old Inlot 827, New Lot 3888, Jennifer Robb, Applicant 11

Mr. Chen reviewed two administrative approvals which were lot consolidations.

Old Business

There was none.

Planning Commission Work Items Items Under Consideration for Future Discussion, 2017 Goals: - Alternative Transportation - Housing - Growth Management

Mr. Chen provided an update on upcoming discussions:

Short Term Rentals, June, July; Business District, May, June; Open House meeting with property owners regarding zoning/proposal, April. Work Session April 11, 2017, 5:30-7:30 .

Adjournment

Mr. Dana made motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. McCarthy seconded the motion. All were in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.