OXFORD PLANNING COMMISSION
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, January 10, 2017
7:30 p.m.

Call to Order

Those members present: David Prytherch, Richard Daniels, Edna Southard, Robert Bell, Steve Dana, Pete McCarthy, and Scott Johnston.
Those members excused: None.
Staff members present: Jung-Han Chen, Sam Perry, and Steve McHugh.
Staff members excused: None.

Election of Officers

Mr. Prytherch responded that the Planning Commission during their work session decided to hold off with the election of officers until their June meeting when a new member comes on board. Mr. Dana moved to table the election of officers until later in 2017. Ms. Southard seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Approval of Minutes of the December 13, 2016 Planning Commission Meeting

Mr. Johnston 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. Dana reported that City Council members, led by the Mayor, would be meeting the new State Representative from the 53rd District, Ms. Candice Keller, to propose action she and the State take regarding the runaway opiate and heroin use in Ohio.

Mr. McCarthy reported that the HAPC met and that they approved the demolition and construction of a redevelopment project located at 104 W. High Street (Phan Shin).

Mr. Bell reported on the Environmental Commission stated that they were finished with their comments on language that is proposed to be incorporated into the planned unit development under sensitive areas of the zoning code.

Ms. Southard reported on the Recreation Board stating they have met and was discussing the location of and development of a new aquatic center at the community park and their assurance that all modes of transportation would be accessibility to get to the new center.

Mr. Prytherch reported on that the City Council and Miami University have made financial commitments to construct an Amtrak platform. Discussion will take place with CSX and how it will be constructed.

Mr. Perry reported on the Oxford Recreational Trail stating that Phase 1 was out for bid. Mr. Perry reported having received strong interests from contractors. Phase 1 will be completed June 2017. In regards to the Phase II trail, they are about complete with their contract and renderings are to come. Mr. Perry reported that the 2014 Bike Pedestrian safety report Dangerous by Design, 2016, was a helpful report that showed disparities between age and ethnic groups and how it affects pedestrian safety. Mr.

Perry stated that he would send around by email. In regards to the Locust street walk about, and the need to report back on, Mr. Perry stated that he would place the information on the department webpage. Lastly, Miami officials have invited some City staff to view a traffic model of the eastern half of the Mile Square, which will be interesting to see.

Mr. Prytherch asked that the Planning Commission have a role in looking at the traffic model and that it was our responsibility to contribute in looking at it. Mr. Chen stated that he would convey Mr. Prytherch's request.

Items Related to Zoning

PC-2016-22, PRELIMINARY & FINAL PLANNED DEVELOPMENT, redevelopment of Miami Village, east and west sides of Arrowhead Drive, south of Chestnut Street, The Verge, GMS Acquisitions LLC, Applicant/Agent

Ms. Southard made motion to enter into Public Hearing PC-2016-22, Mr. Dana seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Mr. Chen provided a PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Chen described the proposed layout. Over 6 acres, will be a single phase development, would demolish 11 buildings (188 units) on 9 different parcels, and construct three new buildings, for a total of 128 units, and decrease the number of curbcuts from 6 to 2. Mr. Chen reviewed the PUD design standards and underlying zoning district site development regulations. Mr. Chen referred to page 8 and 9 of the agenda packet of his analysis in regards to the development regulations review, which included the lot area, setbacks, lot coverage, open space requirement, landscaping, access, and parking.

Mr. Chen's recommendation that this is a good development and is a good time for an update. Mr. Chen reviewed a few issues he did have: pedestrian safety, only two refuse collection facilities, and safety concerns for open access to the railroad track.

Mr. McCarthy inquired how Mr. Chen felt about the setback of 25 versus 30. Discussion followed. Mr. Chen stated that the applicant could explain. Mr. Chen stated that the applicant wanted to utilize the existing driveway.

Mr. Chen reminded the Planning Commission that they had the authority to waive the dimensional requirements. Ms. Southard inquired about the requirements regarding green space and that it seemed like a lot of trees were coming down. Mr. Chen responded that there would be a landscaping requirement for the parking lot. Mr. Prytherch reminded everyone that the application was for combining a preliminary and final planned development.

Mr. Guy Totino, Applicant, was present. Mr. Totino reported that his team was very pleased to make this investment in Oxford. Mr. Totino explained why they were moving the process quickly. Mr. Totino explained their due diligence with the current landowner. Mr. Totino provided a PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Totino described the positive feedback from the Fire and Police Chief's.

Mr. Totino explained the current design which included 11 buildings, 189 units, 8 parking lots, 202 parking spaces, 7 driveways on Arrowhead Drive, and stated that density would decrease. Mr. Totino reported that the occupancy currently is full therefore; the project would not start until June 1, 2017. Mr. Totino displayed current pictures of Miami Village.

Mr. Totino then described the new development which included building elevations and referred

to another development he did and displayed photographs of the former Ashley Commons and what Chestnut Place looks like today.

Ms. Etta Reed, Bayer Becker, was present and explained the landscape and engineering of the project. Ms. Reed explained the development would include an amenity space (common gathering area), each building would include bike racks. Ms. Reed reviewed grading of the site, and that she spoke with the Police Chief, therefore revising the site plan which came about regarding a wall that is problem. The new plan pulled parking away from the south parking lot and pulled away from the drainage way. Ms. Reed described the crosswalk locations, and the location of a 6' fence and a walking path. Ms. Reed discussed the railroad tracks and the Police Chief concerns regarding this. Ms. Reed stated that the fence would take care of his concern.

Ms. Reed reviewed improvements planned for the site: site circulation, eliminated a sanitary lift station, parking would be located behind buildings, would reuse existing pavement as the base for the new pavement.

They will: reduce the number of buildings, reduce the number of units, increase the number of bedrooms, decrease the parking ratio, reduce lot coverage, there would be no change in the open space, and would be reducing the number of access points. Ms. Reed also shared that along the west property line they would be providing a green area along it. They are also reducing the lot coverage and would not need a detention basin.

Ms. Reed referred to the variances they were asking for, it is not one contiguous acre, and they were not meeting lot coverage but they are making an improvement in the open space and with setbacks.

Mr. Dana stated that he was pleased the developer would be planting a lot of trees.

Mr. Bell inquired about landscape numbers and how many trees were being taken down. Ms. Reed described the plan for trees in the parking lot. Mr. Bell inquired if they planned on keeping the beautiful trees at Chestnut and Arrowhead, and some of the existing nice trees along riverbed??

Ms. Reed reviewed the two signs being proposed and that they would be landscaped. Discussion followed regarding landscaping.

Ms. Reed stated that the reason they were doing a PUD was because the R3 District required it. Ms. Reed also stated that the 25' front yard setback was how the development was originally platted.

Fire truck circulation was discussed.

Trash pickup and location of facilities were discussed. Ms. Reed responded trash would be picked up three times per week and that the owners felt would be adequate.

Mr. Bell inquired if there was parking on Arrowhead Drive. Response yes.

An inquiry regarding the traffic study, particularly the intersection of Arrowhead and Chestnut and there being no marked crosswalks, has there been any discussions with City staff regarding this.

Mr. Daniels suggested that the curbs be yellowed all the way to the end of the development because of pedestrians crossing from out their front doors.

No public comments received.

Mr. Dana made motion to close Public Hearing. Mr. McCarthy seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Mr. McCarthy made motion to approve PC-2016-22. Mr. Daniels seconded the motion.

Mr. Prytherch stated that all agree the existing housing stock has outlived its life. Mr. Prytherch addressed staff concerns. Mr. Prytherch reviewed page 10 items 1-4, and stated that these items were all conditions as well: #1. Contiguous requirement. Mr. McCarthy stated that he had no issue with, okay as proposed. #2. Lot coverage - currently 86% revised to 59.59%. Discussion followed. Mr. McCarthy responded that this was a 30% difference in our favor. Ms. Reed referred to the Ohio EPA requiring them to do water quality testing. Some detention will occur. Mr. Prytherch inquired if the Planning Commission should attach a condition here. Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Daniels and Mr. Dana stated they were fine with the way it is. #3. Setback issues - any concerns about the 25' perimeter setback. Response was no. Mr. McCarthy stated okay with all. #4. Open space requirement - Mr. Prytherch stated that he would like to see it mitigated as he sees no trees planted in the front yards but all in the back. Discussion followed. Mr. Johnston felt that additional trees in the front would soften the facade. Many agreed street trees would add to the development. All agreed in keeping the trees in the back and adding street trees in the front yard tree lawn; this to be a condition. Reference was made to the tree standards in the code. Condition: that additional trees shall be planted in the tree lawn and front yard per the code.

Mr. Prytherch inquired about the pedestrian connectivity as presented okay? Are the sidewalks adequate? Mr. Johnston stated that he had a problem with staff having not been able to review the revised site plan. Mr. Chen stated he would review. Condition - that approval of the revised site plan will be contingent upon staff's full review and City Council review.
Mr. Prytherch inquired about students walking trash out to dumpsters so far away. Mr. Totino responded there should be no problem, but should it become a problem, they would address it.

Discussed safety concerns along the railroad track. Ms. Southard inquired if the fence presented was adequate or should there be other barriers. Mr. Bell responded that he didn't see any reason why they would cut through the development and tracks to get to something. Mr. Prytherch agreed that 6 feet was adequate. Mr. McCarthy responded he was good with the 6' fence. Mr. Prytherch stated that he felt some sort of sheltered bike parking was needed. Mr. Totino stated there was an opportunity for space under the stairwells; however, if we have an issue they would certainly consider this. Mr. McCarthy inquired where would the air-conditioning units be located. Mr. Totino stated they would be contained in the units. Discussion followed regarding the entrance into Arrowhead and if it would be marked for pedestrians at all. Mr. Johnston stated that he didn't see this falling under the Applicant's perview. Response from staff that we could add this as a comment for City Council as we want to assure safety at the Arrowhead and Chestnut crossings by providing pedestrian crossing markings.

Discussed student window treatments and not wanting flags, posters, etc., in the windows. Mr. Totino reported that staff have in their contracts no to these kinds of window treatments.

Decision Standards were reviewed.
Motion to recommend approved by waiving the site development regulations as identified by staff and the following conditions:

1. That, additional trees shall be planted and evenly distributed among the tree lawn and front yard, per Oxford Codified Ordinance Chapter 935 governing street trees. Staff will work with the Applicant concerning the distribution of these trees.

2. That, the parking spaces on the south side of the drive between Buildings A and B will be relocated to the north side of the drive. A sidewalk shall be installed on the south side of the drive isle.

AYE: Mr. Bell, Mr. McCarthy, Ms. Southard, Mr. Dana, Mr. Daniels, Mr. Johnston, Mr. Prytherch (7)
NAY: None
ABS: None

Administrative Approval
Mr. Chen shared with the Planning Commission this administrative approval.

PC-2016-24, Lot Consolidation, 336 N. Locust Street, Part of Lots 433, 432, 431, 430, new lot 3888, North Sea Investment Group, LLC, Chris Rodbro, Member

New Business
- Livable Streets (Complete Streets) Policy
Mr. Chen provided a review of the Complete Streets policy. Mr. Chen stated that the decision making would come from the City Manager and not the Service Director to determine. Ultimately it will be City Council's decision on what kind of improvements need to be incorporated into the resurfacing of a city street. Mr. Chen to present to City Council after work session the Planning Commission will have with City Council.

Mr. Bell inquired where the language would reside. Mr. Chen stated that it is a policy now that can in the future become a living document in the development language (planned developments and subdivisions).

Mr. Johnston inquired so this is a policy and could be used as a guideline. Mr. Johnston spoke about performance measurements. Mr. Johnston inquired how other cities handle complete streets' policies. Mr. Chen reported that many other communities have in place complete street policies. Mr. Johnston responded but what is the mechanism and that he thinks there needs to be a link to specific resources. Mr. Daniels responded to get rid of "liveable street" and just call it complete streets; policies ought to say "policy". Mr. Prytherch stated that streets should be fair to all users.

Modifications to the language presented took place.

Mr. Bell made the recommendation for the policy to go before City Council for adoption. Mr. Dana seconded the motion. All were in favor.

Old Business
There was none.

Adjournment
Mr. Prytherch reported that there would only be a work session in February and that the discussion would be priorities and goals for 2017.

Mr. Dana made motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Bell seconded the motion. All were in favor. The meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m.