OXFORD PLANNING COMMISSION
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, March 10, 2015
7:30 p.m.

Call to Order

Mr. Prytherch called the March 10, 2015 meeting to order.
Those members present: David Prytherch, Richard Keebler, Richard Daniels, Kate Rousmaniere, Robert Benson, Peter McCarthy, and Robert Bell.
Those members excused: None.
Staff members present: Jung-Han Chen, Stephen McHugh, and Sam Perry.
Staff members excused: None.

Approval of Minutes of the February 10, 2015 Planning Commission Meeting

Mr. Benson made motion to approve the minutes as written. Ms. Rousmaniere seconded the motion. Mr. Bell, Mr. Daniels, and Mr. Keebler abstained. The minutes were approved 4-0-3.

Public Comments Related to Items Not on the Agenda

There were none.

Reports from Commissions, Boards, Committees & Staff

Mr. Bell reported that the Environmental Commission did not meet because of weather and illness. Mr. Benson reported on HAPC having approved the demolition and rebuild of the Princess Theater. Mr. Benson stated the HAPC were very happy with the conclusion. Mr. Perry stated that the HAPC were meeting to follow up on directives between the HAPC and City Council.

Items Related to Platting

There was none.

Items Related to Zoning

PC-2015-04 ZONING MAP AMENDMENT To establish a Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District in the Southern Knolls Subdivision, specifically Marcia Drive, part of Dana Drive and part of David Drive and Glenview Drive, for a total of 66 parcels in the proposed overlay district, City of Oxford, Applicant

Mr. Daniels made motion to enter into Public Hearing PC-2015-04. Mr. Bell seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Mr. Chen provided an overview describing areas of the Southern Knolls Subdivision affected by the Overlay District application. Mr. Chen noted that part of the Western Knolls had been approved in November for an Overlay District and that no islands were being created. Mr. Chen stated that 66 parcels were affected and that the petition was filed in 2014 with City Council accepting the Overlay in January. Mr. Chen stated that the petitioner obtained 54 signatures and that the application met the boundaries and the 82% requirement of owner signatures.

Ms. Rousmaniere inquired about the portion of the Southern Knolls that had already been approved as a Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District, this portion of Southern Knolls in question, and other Overlay Districts coming forward in the future. Mr. Chen provided an explanation.

Ms. Gayle Brown, 613 David Drive spoke in support of the Neighborhood Conservation Overlay District.

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

Mr. Benson made motion to approve PC-2015-04. Mr. Daniels seconded the motion.

Ms. Rousmaniere reviewed the Planning Commission process for an Overlay District.

The Planning Commission reviewed the Decision Standards for map amendments and overlay district consideration.

AYE: Ms. Rousmaniere, Mr. Bell, Mr. Daniels, Mr. Benson, Mr. Keebler, Mr. Prytherch (6)
NAY: Mr. McCarthy (1)
ABS: None (0)

PC-2015-05 CONDITIONAL USE 7-9 W. High Street To allow a first floor vacant space to be used as an accessory (exercise room) for upper story residential dwelling units, Scott Webb, Applicant/Agent
Mr. Keebler made motion to enter into Public Hearing PC-2015-05. Mr. Bell seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Mr. Chen provided an overview stating the applicant wished to use vacant first floor commercial space as a recreation/exercise/study room for residents of the building. Mr. Chen described the structure having been built in 2011 and that the space in question did not have direct street access; access was located in the alley and from inside the building.

Mr. Chen explained that in order to allow for a residential related use it would be considered a Conditional Use in the Uptown District. Mr. Chen stated that there were no staff concerns. Mr. Chen asked the Planning Commission to consider staff conditions identified in the agenda.

Mr. Prytherch inquired about the patio area. Mr. Chen stated that the patio/balcony was counted into the floor area ratio based upon current code; however, the patio was not part of the application.

Mr. Keebler inquired how we would avoid the space becoming a party room. Mr. Prytherch inquired if the code would allow the Planning Commission to reconsider the conditional use if the space would become a party room. Mr. Chen responded that if the space was not used consistent with what was approved, the City could enforce the code. Mr. McHugh responded that the Planning Commission approve with the condition 1147.02(d) "Action by Planning Commission".

Ms. Rousmaniere noted that exercise and study were two different things. Mr. Chen agreed with Ms. Rousmaniere that the Planning Commission could state what the area could and could not be used for. Mr. Bell stated that if the Commission wanted to make it a specific use the Planning Commission could make that as a condition.

Mr. Scott Webb, the applicant was present. Mr. Webb stated that this was a numbers question; that when the Planning Commission passed the floor/area ratio pertaining to the Uptown District, the ground floor area minimum stated 70% lot area. Mr. Webb referred to his site plan on page 63 of the agenda and that the shaded area was an unused space, that his clients had no goal to provide neither a party room, nor bathrooms or water. Mr. Webb stated that he thought this application was a better question for the BZA for a variance to the floor area ratio and alley access; however, City staff felt that the Planning Commission could answer both. Mr. Webb noted that this was simply an amenity area, dividing the space into two uses - study and exercise.

No public comments were received.

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

Mr. Keebler stated that he had no problem with the request as long as it didn't become a party room; that he wasn't against doing what was asked; however, if not conditioned, he would vote no as the request needed limitations.

Mr. Prytherch understood there were demands to use the first floor as a residential use; however, needed the right conditions.

Ms. Rousmaniere inquired if there was a size requirement of the space. No. Mr. McCarthy inquired if the Planning Commission could condition the application as a renewable use. Mr. McHugh suggested not.

The Planning Commission discussed Staff recommendations. Discussion followed. The Staff conditions were revised to say:

1. The approval of this Conditional Use Permit is only for converting this space to a study and/or exercise room, not a dwelling unit.
2. The Planning Commission would waive the residential floor area ratio to exceed the 2:1 of the lot area, due to this space being used as a residential amenity area, since any outdoor patio, decks and balconies would be counted toward the residential floor area ratio.
3. Any residential use different than the proposed use would require an amendment to this Conditional Use Permit application.

Mr. Bell made motion to approve PC-2015-05 with staff conditions. Mr. Keebler seconded the motion.

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

PC-2015-06 PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION The Fields at Southpointe, intersection of Southpointe Parkway and 27 South, Proposed residential subdivision consisting of 37.014 acres of land into 85 residential lots, Trinitas Development, LLC, Applicant/Agent

Mr. Benson made motion to enter into Public Hearing PC-2015-06. Mr. McCarthy seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Mr. Perry presented. Mr. Perry reviewed the location of the subdivision request, noting that the 37 acres of land was zoned in an R2A (Single- and Two-Family Residential) District fronting on Southpointe Parkway and Corporate Woods Lane. Mr. Perry noted that this application was not for a PUD and that the Planning Commission would not be comparing the Applicant's past application. Mr. Perry stated that this preliminary subdivision application was to ask if the request met the subdivision code and was the property being served properly. The applicant was proposing 86 lots for development, including a clubhouse, pool and recreational courts.

Mr. Perry reviewed an aerial photo, describing the developed and undeveloped land. Mr. Perry reviewed the plat and its layout.
Mr. Perry noted that there were requirements in the subdivision code in regards to streets and sensitive lands; thresholds that need reviewed. Mr. Perry referred to having received a 169 page environmental report and that it was available to review should anyone wish to look at.

Mr. Perry reviewed the subdivision code requirements. Mr. Perry described the general process for a preliminary subdivision application, which included a pre-application, preliminary plat, construction drawings, final plat, record plat and building permits.

Mr. McCarthy inquired when the Planning Commission would see the design, etc., next and that he had a problem with not seeing again until after construction drawings. Mr. Bell inquired about which questions the Planning Commission was allowed to ask at this step in the process. Mr. Prytherch felt that this meeting was the time to have the conversation. Mr. Perry responded that the Planning Commission should be able to make a recommendation at this meeting. Mr. Prytherch noted that this was the first subdivision review since approval of the new subdivision code.

Mr. Perry reviewed the Comprehensive Plan natural areas map, and the open space area. Mr. Perry stated he would like to see a slight variation made to the boundary of the open space area, referring to Lots 81, 82 and 83, and that the current lot line cut down into them, leaving very little buildable area thus impacting the three lots. Mr. Perry referred to having distributed Engineering's latest comments to the Planning Commission. Mr. Perry referenced staff report discussion points worth discussing with the applicant further, which were sensitive development areas (natural areas, pre-determined open space boundaries), street widths, pathway alignment, and maintenance covenants of the common areas. Mr. Perry stated that staff would suggest lining up the multi-paths.

Mr. Benson wished to address density and double access for fire vehicles, and in respect to natural areas, how this fell in with current discussions regarding the Southside Area Development Plan. Mr. Perry noted that there would be another point of egress. Mr. Perry noted that subdivision regulations were different than PUD regulations. Mr. Perry referred to the recent Southside Plan recently tabled by City Council, and for the Planning Commission to follow the Comprehensive Plan vision. Mr. Chen responded telling the Planning Commission to follow the subdivision regulations of the zoning code.

Mr. Daniels inquired about density and what it was based upon. Mr. Perry responded dwelling unit density - how many dwelling units per acre, and that for this development well over 90% would meet the requirement.

Mr. Bell inquired if the block length was within range of size. Mr. Perry responded yes. Mr. Bell inquired if the proposed streets would be public or private. Mr. Perry responded public.

Mr. Chen referenced Mr. McCarthy's question regarding 1159.13(19) definition of lot width. Mr. Bell inquired about areas set aside for amenity spaces and if they were considered conditional uses. Mr. Chen responded that was not in question at this meeting.

Mr. Vencel, the applicant, was present and provided a PowerPoint presentation to counter staff's findings and respond to having met the code with their application. Mr. Vencel described the plan, and reviewed the staff report in regards to sensitive development areas, and that they would work to identify them. In regards to driveways, they proposed that none of lots 56-67 have driveway access. In regards to connectivity, he believed that the pedestrian connectivity access was as direct as possible. Mr. Vencel described the common area lot and maintenance by the Homeowner's Association. Mr. Vencel stated that the final plat would include the covenants and restrictions appropriate for a Homeowner's Association.

In response to existing requirements, Mr. Vencel stated that there was no need to update or alter the requirements. Mr. Vencel reviewed three conditions they proposed: to identify significant vegetation, Lots 56-67 shall not include driveway access, and the Homeowner's association.

Mr. Prytherch inquired Mr. Vencel what would be the mix of dwelling types and occupancy. Mr. Vencel stated the sites were designed for single-and 2-family up to 80 duplexes (660 beds); five of the residential lots could only be used for single-family homes as they were not large enough.

Mr. Keebler inquired about who would be responsible for the alleys. Mr. Vencel responded the intent was public alleys; however, one may not meet that requirement. It was asked if the City had to accept them as public alleys. Mr. Vencel responded if the alleys are constructed by City standards, then they would have to be. Mr. Keebler inquired about the 30' street width minimum and the parking expectation on the streets. Mr. Keebler felt that the street width would only allow parking on one side, or perhaps no parking at all on the streets. Much discussion took place regarding meeting the minimal street widths. Concerns were high.

Mr. McCarthy referred to Engineering's comments received and that the applicant's design was based upon what the City states as the minimum (30'). Mr. Keebler stated he saw a problem with that. Discussion followed.

Mr. McCarthy inquired about during construction if there would be a temporary access provided for construction vehicles. Mr. Vencel responded they could look into.

Mr. Bell inquired about an open space and the removal of trees. Mr. Prytherch referenced the sensitive development area and what the applicant has done to adjust their design to preserve this area. Mr. Vencel described how they shifted areas and were providing various design elevations.

Ms. Kathleen Zien, 6060 Joseph Drive, expressed her concern about parking and meeting the minimum requirements.

Mr. Prytherch noted that the owner of the property was not present at this meeting, and therefore the Planning Commission could assume that the application aligned with what the owner wanted to do. Mr. Chen agreed, since we received a letter of agency signed by Mr. Clawson.

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

Mr. Prytherch described the Planning Commission Subdivision Code Review process.

Mr. Perry read the General Statement of Subdivision Code Review and the design controls: convenient and safe streets, creation of useable lots, provision of space for public utilities, reservation of land for recreation uses, minimizing the impact on natural resources and the environment, ensuring the planning is attractive, connected and functional neighborhoods, provide adequate access to lots and sites, mitigate adverse effects of noise, odor, traffic, drainage, utilities and increased storm runoff on neighboring properties; and that the development shall be laid out to minimize the effect on ground water and aquifer recharge; excavation and embankment; unnecessary impervious cover.
Discussion followed:
1141.401- Suitability of Land was okay;
1101.402 -Sensitive Development Areas. Ms. Rousmaniere inquired in regards to the open space on the north and south sides, and the three lots having been dedicated to Three Valley Conservation. Ms. Rousmaniere continued that Trinitas would still own but preserve, however expressed her concern about open space for residents' green space, not being sufficient (sloped, wet). Mr. Perry stated that staff didn't have a grading plan as it was not a requirement for a preliminary subdivision. Mr. Vencel described what would be designated as useable open space and that by code they were providing open space that wasn't a requirement.

Mr. Keebler inquired who had looked at the grading plan and suggests some lots may not be buildable. Mr. Chen stated that the City Engineer would have to look over to make the determination. Mr. Vencel commented that he didn't want a lot that wasn't buildable either.

1101.402(7) - Existing Vegetation. Do we have enough information to know if the design was sensitive to these areas. Mr. Vencel responded that was why he made condition #1 to identify significant vegetation on lots 65-85 with the Final Plat.

Mr. Bell inquired about the process for determining buildable lots. Ms. Rousmainere stated she had a lot of questions about this too.

Mr. Prytherch referred to Section 1101.404 Street Connectivity, and felt the applicant got the spirit and intent of our street layout. Mr. Bell stated he was curious about the alleys. Mr. Vencel responded that the way they wanted the subdivision to function, and look, the alleys would have parking in the back. Mr. Daniels inquired about garbage pickup and if there were curbs on the alleys. Mr. Vencel responded no. Mr. Daniels inquired if the driveways would come off the alleys. Mr. Vencel responded yes. Mr. Daniels inquired about 12' wide alleys and garbage truck widths and if all parking is pushed to the alley, and garbage carriers are there too, will the alleys become access to get to parking, and will we designate the alley as no parking. Mr. Vencel stated that trash pickup may stay in front. Mr. McCarthy inquired if they could asphalt the alley 20' wide instead of 12' wide. Mr. Vencel inquired would the City approve 20'. Mr. McHugh stated that the City Engineer needed to weigh in on. Mr. Vencel suggested as a condition of approval. Mr. McCarthy expressed concern of parking on the streets.

Mr. Keebler discussed street width requirements, and that there was no way parking could occur on both sides of the street. Mr. Vencel stated he believed some streets allowed parking on both sides, and some would not. It becomes the City's responsibility to do what is best for the City. Mr. Keebler was adamant that the Planning Commission did not agree that parking could occur on both sides of any of the streets. Mr. McCarthy felt there was an error in the code that it should say higher the density the wider the street. Mr. Keebler responded a narrower street is fine, just can't park on it; alleys make sense; you can drive down the alley but can't park in the alley.

Mr. Prytherch inquired if a traffic light had been discussed. Mr. Vencel stated a traffic study was part of the development agreement and, that a signal was determined to not be warranted with this development. Mr. McCarthy inquired about a temporary access road.

Ms. Rousmaniere inquired about bus stops. Mr. Vencel displayed them. Mr. Vencel reviewed the five foot wide sidewalks, and connectivity within the site for pedestrians and bike access.

Mr. Vencel referred to Section 1101.408 Blocks, and that he couldn't guarantee that the blocks would line up perfectly.

Mr. Keebler responded that the applicant could reduce the size of one lot and increase the other lot; the blocks need to be aligned and that there was no question it can be done.

Ms. Rousmaniere inquired about stormwater, maintaining the existing basin and designing the subdivision for proper draining.

Ms. Rousmaniere inquired that nowhere had the Applicant stated what the nature of the housing was. Mr. Vencel responded that most would be student or university affiliated housing. Mr. McHugh responded that who lived there was not a condition of subdivisions. It was noted that 80 lots could potentially be duplexes and a maximum of 660 beds.

Mr. McCarthy stated that the design did not have enough parking spaces.

Subdivision Code Review took place with the Planning Commission.
Section 1101.400, Mr. Perry read aloud "a subdivision design shall ensure that there are convenient and safe streets, creation of useable lots, provision of space for public utilities, reservation of land for recreational uses, minimize the impact on natural resources and the environment, and ensure that the plan is attractive, connected and include functional neighborhoods that will promote minimizing undesirable features of unplanned, unconnected, undirected, haphazard growth".

Also reviewed:
Section 1101.405, Pedestrian/Multi-Use Paths, making reference to the path between Lots 8 and 9 being a challenge due to the grade. And, that currently the path did not connect to any other public access.
Section 1101.406, Infrastructure, agreed that there wasn't a problem with water, sewer and storm water utilities shown on the plans.
Section 1101.407, Driveways, it was stated that the Applicant's Engineer classified Southpointe Parkway as a Minor Collector which allows driveway curb cuts; however, if the road eventually continues for a future development and urban growth beyond the property, the road classification would change to Major Collector, which does not permit driveway curb cuts. this is a concern of the City.
Section 1101.408, Blocks, the alignment has already been discussed.
Section 1101.409, Lots, inquiry about the maintenance of narrow strips of land, it was stated that the HOA would take care of and that there wouldn't be narrow strips attached to a lot.
Section 1101.410, Landscape Plan, a tree plan was submitted. Ms. Rousmaniere asked City staff for recommended tree list.
Section 1101.412 Deed Restrictions, shall be reviewed and approved by the City

Previously Determined Requirements were discussed. Staff highlighted in their report that if the boundaries of the open space are allowed to be altered, the development agreement should also be updated to reflect any new supporting information; and, if a traffic signal is not required to be installed, the development agreement should be updated to reflect any new supporting information.

Some of the Planning Commission stated that they hoped the City Engineer would request a traffic light. Mr. Chen stated that the City Engineer felt the earlier traffic study was sufficient.

Mr. Bell referenced Section 1101.400, Development Layout, reading aloud, that "the development shall be laid out to mitigate adverse effects of noise, odor, traffic, drainage, utilities, and increased storm water runoff on neighboring properties" and that there is a lot of people in a tiny subdivision and that the minimum standards for a street was not necessarily appropriate for this dense population. Continuing, that over time becoming a detriment to the City. Mr. Bell felt that this subdivision request didn't meet many of the Comprehensive Plan's intent. Discussion followed.

Mr. Prytherch inquired Mr. McHugh what the Planning Commission's options were. Mr. McHugh responded approve, approve with conditions, table, and disapprove.

It was stated that Engineering determined that the existing sewer could support the subdivision.

Mr. Prytherch stated that he didn't feel enough information had been provided to make a determination, that there were still major unanswered questions; the sensitive areas, he didn't feel had been addressed. Mr. McCarthy stated that he

didn't feel that the environmental issues were of the Engineer's expertise. Ms. Rousmaniere stated that parking to her was a problem. Mr. Daniels stated that he felt the case was ready to move forward to City Council. Mr. Keebler agreed. Mr. Daniels stated that he agreed with staff recommendations bolded in the staff report. Mr. Prytherch stated that he had trouble recommending approval. Ms. Rousmaniere stated there were more questions she wanted answered regarding parking and sensitive areas.

Mr. Keebler stated that the application was minimal.

Mr. Perry reviewed comments he took from this discussion eight conditions/concerns identified by the Planning Commission, and noted that most could be handled between staff and the applicant: 1. aligning of the pathways - potential redesign, 2. vegetation survey - potential redesign, 3. lot adjustment near sensitive lands, 4. HOA maintaining narrow strips, 5. unbuildable lots be maintained by the HOA, 6. traffic impact update, 7. street widths, and 8. restricting parking to one side of the street.

Mr. McCarthy inquired if a second egress could be built first (emergency access). Mr. McCarthy stated that staff could determine that.

Mr. Vencel responded that they could work with the issues identified; however, regarding a traffic study the State would dictate on traffic study results.

Mr. Daniels made motion to approve PC-2015-06 with conditions. Mr. Keebler seconded the motion.
AYE: Daniels, Keebler (2)
NAY: McCarthy, Benson, Prytherch, Rousmaniere, Bell (5)
ABS: None (0)

PC-2015-07 ZONING MAP AMENDMENT To rezone certain parcels located on West Central Avenue, east of railroad tracks, specifically parcel numbers H4100106000017, H4100106000020 and H4100106000023 from R2MS (Single and Two-Family Residential) District to GB (General Business) District, City of Oxford, Applicant
Mr. McCarthy recused himself.

Ms. Rousmaniere made motion to enter into Public Hearing PC-2015-07. Mr. Bell seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Mr. Chen provided a review. Mr. Chen noted that the request was to rezone three parcels located adjacent to the railroad tracks to GB (General Business) District. Mr. Chen stated the parcels were currently zoned R2MS (Single- and Two-Family Mile-Square Residential) District. Mr. Chen referred to an existing agreement between the property owner and the Ohio EPA restricting the parcels to be used as residential, thus limiting their uses to undevelopable. The City asked that the parcels be zoned like the other properties along the railroad tracks.

Ms. Rousmaniere inquired about the property to the southwest currently zoned GB.

Mr. Benson made motion to close public hearing. Ms. Rousmaniere seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Mr. Benson made motion to approve PC-2015-07. Mr. Daniels seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Mr. Keebler inquired if the parcel could be zoned OI (Office and Light Industrial) District as he wasn't sure storage was appropriate at the location (potentially becoming a storage site).

The Planning Commission reviewed the Decision Standards:

There is an error on the Official Zoning Map or in the delineations between districts thereon. All agreed yes.

Mr. Keebler called the question, after Decision Standard A since only need one needed agreed upon.

AYE: Mr. Daniels, Mr. Benson, Mr. Bell, Ms. Rousmaniere, Mr. Keebler, Mr. Prytherch (6)

NAY: None (0)
ABS: None (0)

PC-2015-08 CONDITIONAL USE 801 S. Beech Street To build a mini-warehouse and business incubator facility Scott Webb, Applicant/Agent
Mr. McCarthy recused himself.

Mr. Bell made motion to enter into Public Hearing PC-2015-08. Mr. Benson seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Mr. Perry provided an overview. Mr. Perry stated that the applicant was proposing an adaptive re-use of a predominantly vacant and underutilized 2-acre property located at the intersection of West Central Avenue, South Beech Street and the railroad tracks. Mr. Perry described the surrounding properties. Mr. Perry described the plan to keep the existing office building, and re-adapt the warehouse structure into an interior self-storage business. New rows of freestanding self-storage buildings will also be constructed all around the site, which will maximize the use of the property along the railroad tracks. Mr. Perry described what took place on the site prior to this request. Mr. Perry described the need to look at what the adverse impacts of the conditional use may be. Mr. Perry referred to the setback along the southern portion of the property.

Mr. Perry referred to recent City Council approval to allow for storage facilities in the General Business District Zoning code as an allowable conditional use.

Mr. Perry noted that facade improvements were planned, and screening along the intersection would occur. Mr. Perry stated there was some greenspace. Mr. Perry referred to the proximity of residential to general business the owners have talked about. Mr. Perry referred to public comments received and Ms. Black, who lives at a neighboring property, and her concerns expressed regarding closeness in proximity to her property.

Mr. Perry stated he felt additional dialogue was needed regarding building articulation, storm water, lighting, landscaping, outdoor storage and any potential accessory uses, additional renderings, elevation drawings and material samples should be shown and explained better of how the site will be harmonious with the area.

Mr. Scott Webb spoke and provided a PowerPoint. Mr. Webb described the proposed layout. Mr. Webb stated that the existing site had an almost zero setback. Mr. Keebler inquired if Planning could discuss the other small parcel (near railroad track reference PC-2015-07) since it wasn't part of this application. Discussion followed. Mr. Perry noted that the staff report did not address the other lot.

Mr. Webb provided a site history. Mr. Perry stated that the abandoned warehouse space would become inside storage units. Mr. Webb stated this would be an adaptive re-use of a warehouse. Mr. Webb described the traffic pattern and that there was adequate parking for the site. Mr. Webb stated that the plan was to maintain the existing green space. Mr. Webb noted that there was a setback issue. Mr. Webb referred to fire safety and Ohio Building Code regulations. Mr. Webb stated that sprinklering was not required by the Building Code and not doable because of the pricetag. The building permit would be applied as a "Change of Use". Mr. Webb described the facade and the owner's desire to provide a community corner. Mr. Prytherch inquired about wall heights. Mr. Webb stated that the Beech Street wall height was 10 feet and along the fencing side 8 feet. It was inquired about street trees along the wall. Mr. Keebler stated there was no tree lawn.

Ms. Rousmaniere inquired about entrances. Mr. Webb stated there were two. It was inquired if conditions were placed for outside storage. Mr. Webb stated yes.

Mr. John Winkler, 816 S. Beech Street expressed concern about traffic potentially being a problem noting that Central was very populated with students, that cars are allowed to park on both sides and if this warehouse could create a lot more traffic.

Mr. Virgil Smith, 127 N. Beech Street, inquired about lighting, noise, and if the warehouse would be open all night. Mr. Webb stated that the warehouse would generate very little traffic, generating only 3-5 cars per day, and that the business incubator would only see few persons (5-7). Parking would be contained in the site. Regarding lighting, Oxford zoning code doesn't allow spillage. Mr. Webb stated it would not be a 24-hour facility.

Ms. Kathleen Zien, 6060 Joseph Drive, referred to the 27N lockers being open from 7:00 a.m. until 8:00 p.m., 7:00 a.m. - 6:00 p.m. on Sunday's and that much of the structure was fire proof. Ms. Zien shared how she travels through Oxford, driving on Central Avenue and that the traffic was minimal except during peak periods.

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

Mr. Keebler stated that his only concern was lot coverage; however, the new use would be no different than what it was now. Mr. Keebler stated that the new use would only improve the area. Mr. Keebler stated he was not so sure of the ten foot wall. Mr. Keebler added that he didn't see a problem with the setback of the southern property line units.

Mr. Bell stated that he didn't know why they couldn't maintain the 25 foot setback along the south side. Mr. Webb responded that after discussion with Ms. Black, an adjacent property owner who inquired about a row of storage units being in close proximity to her property, Mr. Pulley will put back the 25 foot setback, which pleased Ms. Black. Mr. Bell inquired about the parking requirement of incubator space. Mr. Prytherch expressed having problems with the ten foot wall, having no tree lawn, no setback, what is the reasoning except to maximize the use of the lot. Mr. Webb stated that if they pushed the design back, they would lose units. Mr. Prytherch inquired about large trucks and possible truck traffic. Mr. Perry stated that would be a police issue.

Mr. Keebler expressed that this plan was about one of the best uses we could get: low traffic and noise. Mr. Bell inquired about stormwater requirements and assuming they would meet them. The response was yes the City would require they meet.

A condition vote to include a design which included a tree line and a wall died for lack of a second.

The Planning Commission reviewed the Decision Standards. The Planning Commission agreed to all 13 Standards, except for D, the size and shape of the site are sufficient for the proposed use. Mr. Prytherch disagreed with this statement.

Mr. Benson made motion to approve PC-2015-08, waiving the front yard setback, wall height, and south side setback, based upon the testimony of the Applicant. Mr. Keebler seconded the motion.

AYE: Bell, Daniels, Benson, Keebler, Rousmaniere (5)
NAY: Prytherch (1)
ABS: None (0)

New Business
There was none.

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 * Sustainable design standards

Adjournment
Mr. Bell made motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Benson seconded the motion. All were in favor. The meeting adjourned at 11:33 p.m.