BEAVERCREEK PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting – September 6, 2017, 6:00 p.m.

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   A. August 2, 2017

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS
   A. PUD 13-4 MOD 8/17, Major, Home2 Suites by Hilton
   B. PUD 88-18 MOD 8/17, Major, BSM Development
   C. Z-17-2, Kiser Rezoning, R-1A to RO-1

VI. SUBDIVISIONS
   A. S-17-6, Ripple Glen, Sec. 1 Replat

VII. ADJOURNMENT
BEAVERCREEK PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING, August 2, 2017

PRESENT: Ms. Akers, Mr. Curran, Mr. Loftis, Mr. Shrider, Mr. Self

ABSENT: None

Chairman Self called the meeting to order followed by roll call.

Mr. Curran MOVED approval of the agenda. Motion was seconded by Mr. Loftis and PASSED by majority voice vote.

Mr. Curran MOVED approval of the June 7, 2017 minutes. Motion was seconded by Mr. Shrider and PASSED by majority voice vote.

PUBLIC HEARINGS
PUD 17-3, Cedarbrook Flower Farm Rezoning
Clerk Gillaugh read the notice of public hearing on an application filed by Design Homes and Development, 8534 Yankee Street, Dayton, OH 45458. The application requests approval to rezone 28.583 acres from A-1 Agricultural District to R-PUD Residential Planned Unit Development. The property is located at 3240 Shakertown Road further described as Book 6, Page 3, Parcel 63 on the Greene County Property Tax Atlas.

Steve Lisle, Reinke Group, representing Design Homes and Development, stated they are excited to be requesting a rezoning from A-1 to R-PUD. He gave the history of their Design Homes and Development. Mr. Lisle said this is an infill property, and they believed it was a really nice fit for the neighborhood and Beavercreek in general. He explained this property is called out in the Land Use Plan for low-density residential and that Newton Drive will be connected, and they are planning to adhere to those requirements. Mr. Lisle showed a very conceptual drawing, and said the main portion of the site is single-family with approximately six acres on the southwest corner proposed for assisted living or multi-family residential. He said the units per site would not exceed three units per acre. Mr. Lisle showed some architectural drawings of the homes the developer builds.

Mr. Burkett summarized the staff report dated July 28, 2017, which stated the applicant is requesting to rezone the property from A-1 to R-PUD to construct single and multi-family residential homes. He explained the rezoning process and the specific site plan stage and what will be reviewed then. Mr. Burkett discussed the location of the property, the zoning classification for their property and the surrounding properties, the Land Use Plan designation and the requirement that Newton Drive should be extended to Shakertown Road when the property develops, the proposed concept plan, and several of the conditions listed in the resolution. Staff recommended approval of the case with 10 conditions with the suggestion to modify Condition 3 to read “3 dwelling units per acre”.

In public input, Tom Lensch, 3303 Greenburn Road, stated the floodplain was close to them and they were told it would never be developed because of the floodplain. He said he didn’t
have a problem with what was going to be developed as long as it didn’t become an eyesore. Mr. Lensch wanted some more information about the floodplain.

Sandy Hawker, 3411 Leawood Drive, stated she didn’t have a problem with the development. She said she would like to see larger lots, but knew that wasn’t going to happen. She objected to Newton Drive going straight through, but she did agree they needed another exit out of their plat. She didn’t like the straight through because the traffic is going to be a lot worse than it is now, and it is already busy.

Matthew Feeser, 755 Newton Drive, stated he was not opposed to the rezoning, but did have concerns with the water runoff. He asked for the aerial view to be shown and said the dark spot in the northwest corner is water. Mr. Feeser explained they tapped into an artesian well when they built the condos on the corner, and all the houses in the plat that were built in the 1960s are on well water and that could become an issue if they hit another artesian well. He stated he also had concerns with the traffic if Newton Drive is continued through the proposed plat. Mr. Feeser questioned how the issues will be fixed and how he can be assured the issues will be addressed beforehand instead of letters he has that are dated over 10 years ago and nothing has been done.

Eric Sproesser, 815 Newton Drive, said he isn’t against development and felt that development was good. He explained one of his concerns is the traffic, and low traffic and one way in and out was one of the selling points for why he bought his house. Mr. Sproesser said another concern is Merrick Park, and said they are going to mess or adjust the flood zone here. He said the stream that flows into Merrick Park is going to be impacted, and asked if there was a study done on how that is going to be affected. Mr. Sproesser referred to Chapter 158.071 (C), and raised a question regarding land use intensity and how many acres could be developed. He said his last concern was the assisted living facility, and said he read that they could not put that type of development in an R-PUD.

Dan Long, 788 Newton Drive, stated he is not opposed to the construction, but was concerned about the traffic. He said there are no sidewalks on Newton Drive, and people are walking their animals and there are kids riding bikes. Mr. Long felt it was going to be a problem if Newton Drive was cut through. He explained his other concern was water. Mr. Long said he and his neighbors are on wells, and with that much construction he was concerned the water will change or disappear.

John Norckauer, 3431 Hickory Court, said he addressed City Council years ago about water runoff and his back yard is consistently wet because of the church runoff. He said he isn’t against the development, but he has concerns about where the water is going to go and how it will be addressed. Mr. Norckauer was worried about the increase of traffic on Newton Drive with the small children and people walking. He stated when the condos went in they hit numerous artesian wells, and was worried if new development hits the spring also and they funnel it to the creek it will not help them with their wells.
Chris Salley, 3182 Creekside Drive, stated he was concerned about water and the flow of traffic on Newton Drive if it is opened up to the new development. He said one of the selling points for him also was there was one way in and one way out of their development. Mr. Salley explained the lot sizes were another concern, and he said every time the schools come out with a levy one of the big selling points is there is overcrowding. He questioned if they were doing anything long term to mitigate it or if they are making it worse by putting in a new development where three houses to the acre can be built.

There being no further public input, the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Loftis asked if the side yard setbacks could be made a little bit larger, and questioned how it would adversely affect the layout if they added five more feet. Mr. Burkett said it would make it much more challenging, and would really limit the architecture. He said the minimum setback is five feet, but between the houses there needs to be at least 15 feet. Mr. Loftis asked if the multi-family units were going to be condos or apartments. Mr. Burkett explained it was not specified in the application, and believed they were going to be condo. Mr. Loftis questioned what the density was. Mr. Burkett explained the preliminary plan shows three dwelling units per acre.

Mr. Loftis asked if there were concerns with the floodway. Mr. Burkett explained there is a difference between the floodway and the floodplain, and discussed the FEMA regulations to build in the floodplain. He said the creek cannot be disturbed because it is in the floodway. Mr. Loftis asked how raising the land would affect the flow of water. Mr. Burkett explained at the specific site plan they will be required to install a storm water detention pond for additional runoff created by this development. He referred to the citizen’s comment about 45% land use intensity, and he explained that is the buildings, driveways and streets. Mr. Burkett stated anything in the buildings, driveways, and streets that creates more runoff than on the site now will have to be accounted for and be held in the storm water area and slowly released into the ground. Mr. Loftis asked when the aerial was taken that showed the dark water area in the northwest corner. Mr. Burkett said they are taken around March. Mr. Loftis questioned if any studies have been done in that area as far as the saturation. Mr. Burkett said that would be addressed at the next phase. Mr. Loftis and Mr. Burkett discussed the surrounding properties that were on wells.

Mr. Loftis asked what the average selling price is for the units. Shery Oakes, President of Design Homes and Development Company, stated the starting point is $350,000 and the average being around $450,000 for the empty-nest homes, and the single-family homes are average around $500,000. She explained they wanted to bring a product that was not in Beavercreek.

Mr. Curran was concerned about the road access through the plat. He knew there was a policy in the City where the roads are already hooked up, but he thought it should be decided on a case by case basis. He didn’t think it should be automatic, but he understood it was a safety concern for the Fire Department and thought there could be a gate there so the older neighborhood could be preserved. Mr. Curran stated there would be about 300 homes.
constructed, and questioned how much more traffic that was going to generate. Mr. McGrath explained the 320 homes they referenced is what is currently off the access point of Newton Drive. He said the most residential units that could be constructed on this property will be 85. Mr. McGrath stated there is no overriding policy that says streets have to connect and they are looked at by a case by case basis in PUDs. He explained in this case the Land Use Plan specifically says Newton Drive should be connected to Shakertown Road. Mr. McGrath explained that was a policy that was derived by Planning Commission and City Council. He said this is in a Vacant Planning Areas (VPA), and those areas are paid close attention to and how they should be developed. He said that is the guiding principal for rezoning the properties, which is looking at the density and the text associated with the VPA. Mr. McGrath stated if Newton Drive is connected it would alleviate some congestion at Newton Drive and North Fairfield Road by allowing cars to exit on Shakertown Road. Mr. Curran felt that it would increase safety concerns with the residents in the existing area. Mr. McGrath said it could, and safety is relative depending upon the situation they are talking about.

Ms. Akers asked if sidewalks would be required to be implemented in the new neighborhood. Mr. Burkett explained when they come through for a specific site plan they will have to have sidewalks on the roadway because it is part of the Subdivision Regulations. Ms. Akers asked if there would be a turn lane installed on Shakertown Road at the Newton Drive entrance. Mr. Burkett said he hasn’t looked at the design of Shakertown Road yet because this is conceptual, but they are going to have to have a left turn if it is not there already. Mr. Burkett said the applicant is saying there is already a turn lane. Ms. Akers was concerned about the 15-foot setback between homes also.

Mr. Self asked when they build the houses if the front setback is varied. Mrs. Oakes said they would typically be on the same setback. Mr. Self said since there seemed to be some concern about the side yard width, he wondered if the front of the houses are in a line. Mr. Lisle stated some of the house have the garages in the front and some don't so that will provide some stager. He explained when they are laying out a development they work with the products they build and that is how a side yard setback is created. Mr. Lisle said as they get pinched on the side yard they cannot build some of the houses. Mr. Self said the connection with Newton Drive is a double edged sword because to have a subdivision of that size with one outlet is bad planning and the other side is they may get some through traffic. He suggested doing something with Newton Drive so it is not a straight shot, but he believed they needed the second access. Mr. Lisle explained they are limited in some aspects, but they would look at some type of traffic calming device or to slow it down.

Mr. Self asked what the side yard setback is for an R-1A property. Mr. Burkett stated the minimum is 10 feet with both sides totaling 25 feet on a 20,000 square foot lot with a 100-foot minimum right-of-way. Mr. Self and Mr. Burkett discussed the water runoff. Mr. Self remembered when Ballymeade was built they hit an artesian spring and had to run a drain down into Merrick Creek, and asked how that would be handled if it occurred again with this development. Mr. Burkett stated they will try to work with the Engineers to see if the springs can be located. Mr. Self said the fact is that it will not affect the existing properties in terms of making things worse. Mr. Burkett stated the stormwater runoff requirements states a
development cannot increase the amount of runoff. Mr. Self thought if they ran into any more springs up in the corner they could tie into the springs that are serving under Ballymeade. Mr. Burkett said they would find a way to mitigate it so it does not flow down the drainage ditches. Mr. Self referred to Merrick Park and stated the park dead ends into this parcel. Mr. Burkett said yes. Mr. Self asked if they were going to dedicate some land in lieu of park fees as park space. Mr. Burkett said that had not been discussed with the Parks Director yet, and didn’t think it would be in lieu of a park fee because he thought they would be putting the storm water detention on that open space. Mr. Self asked if they could put the detention basin on top of the creek. Mr. Burkett stated no, they have to leave the creek alone.

Mr. Loftis asked if Newton Drive was already stubbed. Mr. Burkett said it ends about 40 feet from the property line. Mr. Loftis questioned if it was originally set up as a stub street. Mr. Burkett explained it does not have curbs, but the road ends into the grass. He said there is a stub, and the City has the right-of-way all the way to the property line.

Mr. Curran MOVED to approve PUD 17-3 with 10 conditions, modifying Condition #3:

1. The specific site plan shall generally conform to the plans dated “July 25, 2017”, except as modified herein.

2. Principal and accessory uses permitted in this Residential Planned Unit Development shall be:
   a) Principal, conditional, and accessory uses permitted in the R-1A zoning district.
   b) Multi-Family Residential, no more than 4-units per building (not applicable to assisted living facilities)

3. Maximum density for this R- PUD shall be 3 dwelling units per acre.

4. Lots shall be a minimum of 60 feet wide.

5. Any proposed lots which are directly adjacent to R-1A residential lots, shall be a minimum 20,000 square feet.

6. There shall be a 50-foot building buffer between any new multi-family residential or assisted living buildings and any new or existing single family residential property lines.

7. Minimum Building Setbacks for this PUD are as follows:
   a) 30-foot minimum front yard.
   b) 35-foot minimum rear yard, except lots that abut existing R-1A lots, which shall be a minimum of 50-foot rear yard setback.
c) 5-foot minimum side yard; total of both side yards 15 feet minimum. No single family structures shall be closer than 15 feet apart. For lots abutting existing R-1A lots, there shall be a minimum 10-foot side yard setback.

8. Points of access and vehicular circulation as shown on the concept plan are subject to City of Beavercreek final review and approval at the specific site plan stage.

9. Building plans, designs and elevations for residential structures within this project shall be subject to review and approval by Planning Commission and City Council at specific site plan stage.

10. The applicant shall be required to pay all applicable park fees, or dedicate parkland in lieu of park fees as determined by the City Manager, Planning Department and/or Parks Department prior to releasing the record plan for recording.

Motion was seconded by Mr. Shrider. Motion PASSED by a roll call vote of 5-0.

**PUD 17-2, Speedway**

Clerk Gillaugh read the notice of public hearing on an application filed by Speedway LLC, 600 Speedway Drive, Enon, OH 45323. The application requests approval to rezone approximately 1.16 acres from B-3, General Business District and B-2, Community Business District to C-PUD Commercial Planned Unit Development. The property is located at 3991 Indian Ripple Road further described as Book 3, Page 21, Parcel 257 and part of Parcel 133 on the Greene County Property Tax Atlas.

Rob Sweet, McBride Dale Clarion, stated they are requesting rezoning of a 1.16 acre property. He explained Speedway currently owns the existing location at 3991 Indian Ripple Road, and they have an option to purchase a third of an acre from the neighbor to the south. Mr. Sweet felt the PUD will allow them to redevelop the existing facility, and will be very similar to what was constructed at the Fairfield/Kemp intersection. He said they are in agreement to the conditions, and some of this is brought on by the right-of-way dedication required.

Mr. Burkett summarized the staff report dated July 28, 2017, which stated the applicant is requesting to rezone 1.16 acres from B-3 and B-2 to C-PUD to raze the existing Speedway and build new. He discussed the location of the property, the existing site conditions, the existing stormwater detention area, the zoning classification for the parcel and the surrounding properties’ zoning classifications, the Land Use Plan designation, the concept plan, and the permitted principal uses. Staff recommended approval of the case with six conditions.

In public input, John Scott, owner of 3979 Indian Ripple Road, stated he was concerned about his driveway and the Speedway driveway being right next to each other. He explained the new building will block the view of his building, and he is concerned with traffic since it is
already a congested area. Mr. Scott said cars will pull in his lot and go to the Speedway so he has less parking spots available for his tenants. He stated a lot of the trash from Speedway blows over to his strip center, and the landscaping bed is consistently full of weeds. Mr. Scott was concerned by blocking his building it will lower his property value.

There being no public input, the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Loftis explained the landscaping issues would be addressed at the specific site plan stage. He was pleased to see they were going to move one of the driveways because it would be farther away from the intersection.

Mr. Self asked if they will have to do a lot recombination. Mr. Burkett said one of the conditions of the specific site plan stage will be for them to combine it into one lot. Mr. Self questioned if a condition needed to be added about screening the air conditioner units. Mr. Burkett thought it would be part of the specific site plan resolution. Mr. Self asked if staff has explored combining the two accesses on Indian Ripple Road between the two properties. Mr. Burkett explained that was discussed, but it is not going to work out.

Mr. Loftis explained the rezoning is a good thing because they can address the citizen’s comments at the specific site plan stage.

Mr. Loftis MOVED to approve PUD 17-2 with six conditions:

1. The concept plan dated “Received June 29, 2017” shall be adopted as the approved concept plan for this C-PUD, except as modified herein.

2. The permitted and conditionally permitted uses within this PUD shall be those uses that are conditional and permitted in B-3 zoning districts, with the exception of the following:

   a. Banquet halls
   b. Bingo Halls
   c. Bowling alleys
   d. Meeting and party rooms
   e. Party rooms
   f. Towing Service
   g. Vehicle paint and body shops
   h. Vehicle parking garages and lots (commercial)
   i. Vehicle repair stations (Major)
   j. Vehicle sales and service (new and used)
   k. Veterinary clinic with kennels or animal hospitals

3. Debris and trash shall be routinely collected by the owner from the parking lot and grounds of all areas of the project including the storm drainage facilities. The City reserves the right to require more frequent collection as necessary.
4. All new buildings shall incorporate four-sided architecture and shall have no apparent rear. All dumpster enclosures shall incorporate three-sided architecture and an opaque front that is constructed of materials that match the new buildings. The buildings and dumpster enclosure shall be designed as required by the Planning Department, Planning Commission and City Council at the Specific Site Plan.

5. The building setbacks shall be set at the specific site plan stage.

6. The access points and types of access shall be subject to the approval of the City Engineer, Planning Commission, and City Council at the Specific Site Plan.

Motion was seconded by Mr. Curran. Motion PASSED by a roll call vote of 5-0.

PUD 427 MOD 7/17, Major, Trinity Community Campus
Clerk Gillaugh read the notice of public hearing on an application filed by United Church Homes, Inc., 170 E. Center Street, Marion, OH 43301. The applicant requests a major modification for 25.085 acres of land to replace two existing 4-unit buildings with three, one-story, 4-unit independent living apartments, construct two, 2-story assisted living apartment buildings, and to construct a small maintenance facility located at 3218 Indian Ripple Road. The property is further described as Book 6, Page 8, Parcel 33 on the Greene County Property Tax Atlas.

Brad Judge, Judge Engineering Company, stated they are requesting a modification to allow for the demolition of two existing four-unit buildings on the northwest corner and replacing them with three four-unit buildings, and to construct two buildings that are joined totaling 40,000 square feet. He said they are looking to improve the general circulation of the area with road modifications. Mr. Judge explained there would be an additional 12 employees per shift, and said there will be 16 additional parking spaces for the two joined buildings. He said that does meet the City Code requirements, but felt it was important to point out that a large number of occupants will be memory care patients.

Mr. Burkett summarized the staff report dated July 28, 2017, which stated the modification will allow for the construction of assisted living and independent living facilities on 25 acres. He discussed the location of the property, the existing site conditions, the access point, the zoning classification for the property under discussion and the surrounding properties’ zoning classifications, the proposed site plan, the parking requirements, the proposed relocation of the access point on Indian Ripple Road, the architectural renderings, the landscaping plan, and the lighting plan. Staff recommended approval of the case with 16 conditions.

In public input, Geneva Campbell, 25 Secore Court, thought it was very important to take staff’s recommendation and align the entrance with Secore Court. She said it is very rough getting in and out because they widened the road to make a turn lane into the nursing home, but they have to go past it to turn into Secore Court. She requested they line it up and there are turn lanes into Trinity and onto Secore Court. Mrs. Campbell explained there is a line-of-site issue and Indian Ripple Road needs to be taken down at least two feet in this location.
After the applicant spoke, she believed memory care is skilled nursing and is not independent living, and questioned if she didn’t understand something correctly. Mr. Burkett explained the two large buildings were for assisted living/memory care. Mrs. Campbell asked with the memory care if they would have nursing care. Mr. Burkett stated there would be some nursing services in the assisted living facility.

Derrick Petry, 3261 Tarleton Drive, said it was stated there is a tree line along the northern property line that serves as a buffer, but many of the trees were ash and have been removed. Mr. Petry shared he was concerned with the parking lot and structure being located behind his house, and requested the buffer be constructed because it is not much of a buffer right now. Mr. Petry explained in the winter when someone pulls into the last driveway, he has headlights that shine into his back yard.

Alan Bertke, 3249 Tarleton Drive, stated they lost 47 trees in the last three years along the north property line. He said this was a disaster because of the wildlife, and explained several different birds he had seen on their property. Mr. Bertke expressed his concern was the trees, and said there are only 27 trees left in that area. He stated they would be approximately 150 feet from the lights and the road is in the buffer zone. He believed that road could go into Durnbaugh’s farm in the future which would create more traffic so he requested evergreens to be planted. Mr. Bertke said in the middle of the night he counted between 80 or 90 lights, and said that number was going to increase with this proposal. He asked if they could do something about the lighting.

There being no further public input, the public hearing was closed.

Ms. Akers asked if there was any way they could adjust some of the parking in the northwestern corner since they have 25 extra parking spaces for the site. Mr. Judge said they could look into it, but they are somewhat limited because they are landlocked and the terrain in that corner. Ms. Akers said if the parking could be moved they would then have room to move the evergreens around. Mr. Judge stated the applicant is willing to supplement the screening that is there.

Mr. Shrider asked how many of the existing trees will be removed when the buildings are constructed along the northern property line. Mr. Judge stated they have done a tree survey of the whole site, and there will be some removal but between what is already dead and what they have to displace it should be minimal.

Mr. Loftis questioned if the applicant would be opposed to berming and landscaping along the northern property line. Mr. Judge thought it was possible but one concern when they do something like that is trapping water. He said they could look at some lower branch type species and what that would to for screening. Mr. Loftis explained the reason he was thinking of having a berm installed was because they will be planting younger trees, so they are not going to have a lot of height and the berm would make them higher from the beginning. Mr. Loftis asked what staff’s opinion was regarding the berming. Mr. Burkett explained when a berm is installed all the trees have to be removed, which is why they are hesitate to require a
berm unless it is a vacant lot already. He stated they show a good amount of evergreen trees to help shield out the headlights, and said they can look into adding some evergreen shrubs at the end of the driveways. Mr. Loftis questioned how tall the pine trees need to be when they are installed. Mr. Burkett stated at least six feet. Mr. Loftis asked if the Fire Department was ok with a single egress/ingress point. Mr. Burkett explained this was forwarded to them, and they did not have any concerns.

Mr. Self asked if there was a lighting plan. Mr. Burkett said it did not show the photometrics in terms of footcandles projected out. Mr. Self said he was concerned with light spillover in the parking lot in the northwest corner, and knew it was going to be lit because there would be staff coming and going at night. Mr. Burkett explained they can limit the height of the poles and make sure they are full cut off fixtures. Mr. Self referred to the site plan, and stated he did not see any screening between the northern property line and two of the four-unit buildings. Mr. Burkett said they could look at having them install some evergreen trees or shrubs in those locations.

Mr. Judge stated they are in agreement with all of the conditions, but had a concern about one of them. He referred to Condition #16, regarding the main entrance and asked that it be removed because he felt it was covered under Condition #7. Mr. Judge explained they would like some more discussion with staff regarding the location of the driveway. He said there are only 12 additional staff members per shift that will be coming, and the current driveway is located at the highest point of the roadway so it has the maximum site distance along the entire frontage of the property. Mr. Judge explained Secore Court is two feet below that elevation, and then you drop into Secore Court as a car comes off Indian Ripple Road. Mr. Moorman stated they have had some brief discussions about the entrance, and he did feel like some further discussions are warranted. He requested the condition remain, and they meet and discuss it before it goes to City Council. Mr. Moorman said the overall goal is to reach an agreement between the City and the developer prior to City Council so they can amend the condition if needed.

Mr. Loftis MOVED to approve PUD 427 MOD 7/17 with 16 conditions:

1. The approved site plans shall be the plans dated “Received July 6, 2017 except as modified herein. The approved architectural plans shall be the plans dated “Received July 25, 2017 except as modified herein.

2. All building mechanical equipment is to be completely screened from all directions with architectural features (roof forms or parapet walls) on each building. Metal screening will not be accepted. Pad mounted equipment must be screened with landscaping and/or masonry walls and shall not be visible to the public. The final screening design and materials shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department, prior to the release of a zoning permit for the project.

3. A PUD Agreement must be signed by the owner and a bond or letter of credit for the site landscaping must be submitted prior to issuance of a zoning permit for any portion of the
project for the purpose, but not for the sole purpose, of insuring the installation of landscaping. Said bond or letter of credit must meet the requirements of the City's landscaping and screening regulations.

4. Perpetual maintenance of landscaping shall be provided and any dead or diseased materials shall be removed and replaced with similar types, species and sizes, as originally planted, within three months, weather permitting.

5. All new trash collection containers shall be enclosed within a building or screened from view and enclosed within a permanent dumpster enclosure. All dumpster enclosures shall be constructed with materials to match the building. The final location of the dumpster shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Zoning Department prior to the issuance of a zoning permit.

6. Debris and trash shall be routinely collected by the owner from the parking lot and grounds of all areas of the project including the storm drainage facilities. The City reserves the right to require more frequent collection as necessary.

7. All concerns of the City Engineer, Fire Department, Sanitary Engineer and the Planning Department shall be addressed and approved prior to the release of a zoning permit.

8. All man-doors and service doors shall be painted to match the color of the building as to blend in with the proposed facade.

9. The architectural design and materials of the maintenance facility shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department prior to the release of a permit. The maintenance facility shall be architecturally compatible with the other new buildings, and shall have a brick base, be one-story and have a pitched asphalt shingle roof.

10. The proposed light fixtures within the development shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department prior to the release of the record plan for recording. The fixtures shall be consistent with the fixtures used throughout the rest of the College Park development.

11. Final drainage calculations shall be approved by the City Engineer prior to the release of the record plat for recording.

12. Downspouts shall be painted to match the adjacent architectural materials.

13. Construction hours shall be limited to 7am-7pm Monday through Saturday.

14. Trash collection and deliveries shall only be permitted from 7am-7pm Monday through Saturday.
15. Additional brick siding shall be added to the western elevations of the two assisted living facilities, as shown on Exhibit A.

16. The main entrance to the site shall be moved to the west to line up with Secore Court.

Motion was seconded by Mr. Shrider. Motion PASSED by a roll call vote of 5-0.

DECISION ITEMS
PUD 541 MOD 7/17, Minor, At Home Renovation
Ms. Pereira summarized the staff report dated July 19, 2017 on a request by Bob Moran, Parkway Architects, 1000 Civic Circle, Lewisville, TX 75067. The applicant is requesting approval of a minor modification of PUD 541 that would allow for the renovation of the recently closed and vacated Kmart store. The renovation would include a façade upgrade, parking lot renovations, and new signage. Staff recommended approval of the case with 18 conditions.

Ms. Akers asked how tall the ground sign was going to be, and if it was going to be visible. Ms. Pereira explained the sign is going to be seven feet tall, and the rendering was not quite accurate. She believed it was going to be moved further east, and staff has requested the bushes and trees are removed because they are overgrown. Ms. Pereira said there is also a condition that states the final location will need to be approved by staff prior to the release of a zoning permit.

Mr. Curran questioned if there was any potential for an outlot here. Ms. Pereira said they have a sign up advertising it now, but staff has not heard anything about it yet.

Mr. Loftis asked if staff typically requires a bond for the landscaping. Ms. Pereira said yes, and it is Conditions #2, #3, #4, and #5. He was pleased they were going to renovate an aging building with better landscaping and lighting that is more congruent with the surrounding area.

Mr. Self asked if there was any of these stores in the area. Ms. Pereira explained there is one in Cincinnati, one in Columbus, and a few throughout the country. Dane Ridenour stated At Home was originally founded in Texas, and they are expanding northeast. He explained they have about 160 stores right now with a goal of 600 stores nationwide. Mr. Ridenour believed they could make the Kmart building look a whole lot better. He said there is one issue regarding Condition #16 about improving the detention pond. Mr. Ridenour explained the parcel they are dealing with the owner on is just the Kmart parcel and is not the shopping center beside them. He stated they have done a title search, and they have no control or rights of access to that detention area so that would be something difficult to accomplish. He said they are willing to clean it up if they can get access to do so, but that is not something they can agree to right now because they don’t have a legal way to do it.

Mr. Self asked if At Home sold furniture and home décor items. Mr. Ridenour discussed the types of items they would sell. He explained they call themselves the Home Décor
Superstore, and that is the tag line that goes on the building. Mr. Ridenour said the signage that was included in the packet wasn't the latest version, and instead of having the three words stacked it will just be one line. Mr. Self questioned if it was the same square footage. Mr. Ridenour said yes.

Ms. Akers asked staff to address Condition #16. Ms. Pereira said staff was under the impression there was some sort of easement that allowed them to have access to clean it up, but since they don't, staff doesn't have an issue with removing it because they do not have anything to tie them to taking care of the pond. Mr. Self asked if it served that site. Ms. Pereira said yes, and the City Engineer could go after whoever owns it to get it cleaned up. Mr. Self asked if staff recommended to remove that condition then. Ms. Pereira said yes.

Mr. Loftis asked if it should be left but have something put in like if the City can secure right-of-way or rights to access the land. Ms. Pereira explained the owner is the shopping center to the east, and originally staff thought they all had some sort of agreement or easement requiring them to all maintain it. She said that is apparently not the case, and she didn't know if they wanted to tie it to them since they have no control over it. Mrs. Blankenship agreed that the City wouldn't want to tie something to this property owner they have no control over. Mr. Self said the City can go after the owner because it is their responsibility to maintain it.

Mr. Shrider MOVED to approve PUD 541 MOD 7/17 with 17 conditions, removing Condition #16:

1. The plans stamped “Received July 7 2017” shall be the approved plans for this renovation including elevations and signage except as modified herein.

2. A PUD Agreement must be signed by the owner and a bond or letter of credit must be submitted prior to issuance of a zoning permit for any portion of the project for the purpose, but not for the sole purpose, of insuring the installation of landscaping. Said bond or letter of credit must meet the requirements of the Planning and Zoning Department.

3. A detailed landscape plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department prior to the execution of the required PUD Agreement and the release of a zoning permit for the renovations. The final landscape plan shall include landscaping within all newly created landscape islands.

4. Perpetual maintenance of landscaping shall be provided and any dead or diseased materials shall be removed and replaced with similar types, species and sizes as originally planted, within three months, weather permitting.

5. All dead, dying, or diseased trees, shrubs, and plants currently on site shall be removed and all existing live plantings shall be trimmed back and properly maintained.
6. A permanent sign permit application must be approved by the Planning and Zoning Department for each proposed sign prior to its installation. Each sign will require final design approval by the Planning and Zoning Department prior to the release of zoning permits.

7. The final design and location of the ground sign shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Zoning Department prior to installation and must include a masonry base and wrap to match the materials used on the building.

8. No temporary signs of any kind will be permitted unless otherwise approved by the Planning Department and/or Planning Commission.

9. Material and color samples shall be submitted to the Planning Department for review and approval prior to the issuance of a zoning permit. The final color of all materials used on the building shall be approved by the Planning Department prior to the issuance of a zoning permit for the building.

10. All roof top mechanical units shall be completely screened from view from all directions with architectural features (roof forms or parapets).

11. All debris and trash shall be completely removed from the entire site prior to opening and routinely collected by the owner from the parking lot and grounds of all areas of the project including storm drainage facilities. The City reserves the right to require more frequent collection as deemed necessary.

12. The parking lot and access road shall be kept in good condition. The City Engineer reserves the right to determine if the parking lot and access road pavement condition is in disrepair and has not been maintained in a commercially acceptable condition, and that improvements are required. Required improvements shall be completed in a timely manner to the City Engineer’s satisfaction.

13. The display and/or sale of goods outside of the building shall be prohibited.

14. The final design of the cart corrals shall be approved by the Planning and Zoning Department prior to the issuance of zoning permits.

15. All dumpsters must be contained within dumpster enclosures with lockable gates.

16. Gutters and downspouts shall not be visible on the south elevation of the building and shall be internally mounted.
17. The light pole located adjacent to the handicap parking must be removed or relocated within a landscape island.

Motion was seconded by Mr. Curran. Motion PASSED by a roll call vote of 5-0.

SUBDIVISIONS
S-17-4, College Hills Estates, Sec. 3
Ms. Pereira summarized the staff report dated July 27, 2017 on a request by Loren Marshall, 2855 Locke Drive, Beavercreek, OH 45431. The applicant is requesting approval of a replat to incorporate a portion of unplatted property into the existing College Hills Estates. Staff recommended approval of the case with three conditions.

Mr. Curran MOVED to approve S-17-4 with three conditions:

1. The approved record plan shall be the plan stamped “Received June 08, 2017”, except as modified below.

2. All concerns and comments of the Planning and Zoning Department, City Engineer, Greene County Sanitary Engineering Department, Greene County Auditor, public utility providers, and the Beavercreek Township Fire Department shall be addressed and satisfied prior to release of the record plan for recording.

3. Prior to release of the record plan for recording, the applicant shall provide a digital format file of the subdivision in Autocad or .dxf format.

Motion was seconded by Mr. Loftis. Motion PASSED by a roll call vote of 5-0.

ADJOURNMENT
Mr. Loftis MOVED adjournment at 8:12 p.m., seconded by Mr. Akers. Motion PASSED by majority voice vote.

______________
Melissa Gillaug
Deputy Clerk
REQUEST BY APPLICANT:

The applicant is requesting approval to construct a 107-room, 5 story hotel on 1.81 acres, located on Lot 5P of the Mall at Fairfield Commons, just south of Red Robin and Fox and Hound restaurants. The applicant developed a 118-room hotel on the western portion of the PUD and intends to develop this second hotel on the eastern portion of the site.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff is recommending approval of this major modification as outlined in the attached Resolution.

PROCEDURAL OPTIONS FOLLOWING ACTION:

The Planning Commission may choose to recommend approval, disapproval, modification or table the attached application for further review.
PROJECT: Home2 Suites by Hilton
CASE NO.: PUD 13-4 MOD 8/17 (Major)
APPLICANT: High Five Development
c/o Blake Helms (Agent for owner)
202 West Main Street
Mason, OH 45040

REQUEST

The applicant is requesting approval to construct a 107-room, 5-story hotel on 1.81 acres, located on Lot 5P of the Mall at Fairfield Commons, just south of Red Robin and Fox and Hound restaurants. The applicant developed a 118-room hotel on the western portion of the PUD and now plans to develop this second hotel on the eastern portion of the site, as was intended when the PUD as a whole was rezoned.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

As evident on the aerial photo to the right, half of the PUD is vacant, while the western half of the PUD contains the recently constructed Spring Hill Suites (same owner as hotel in this application). The main access to the site is the access drive in front of both Red Robin and Fox and Hound. Each of the two restaurants also have secondary curb cuts to this PUD for cross-access. Other than the long access drive, the lot is approximately 320 feet deep, 550 feet wide, and sits back approximately 275 feet from Fairfield Commons Blvd.
Zoning

The property was rezoned to C-PUD 13-4 in 2013. Hotels are a permitted use within the PUD.

The chart below shows all surrounding properties zoning and usage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Zoning Classifications</th>
<th>Current Usages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>C-PUD 97-13</td>
<td>Restaurants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>C-PUD 98-1</td>
<td>Professional Office Buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Remainder of PUD 13-4/C-PUD 97-13</td>
<td>Hotel/Movie Theater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>C-PUD 88-21 (B4)</td>
<td>Retail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Availability of Utilities

Public water and sewer are available.

Access, Circulation and Transportation Improvements

The primary access point to the development is at the end of a 275-foot access drive connecting to the mall ring road (shown on plans as Fairfield Commons Drive), which also serves as the access road for Fox and Hound and Red Robin. The secondary access points will be off of the parking lot for Red Robin. All drive aisles are appropriately sized to provide for two-way traffic throughout the site. As further explained below, to provide adequate pervious surface for this site, the applicant is showing the use of pervious cell block paver system in a portion of the majority of the parking spaces on site. A condition (Condition #14) in the proposed Resolution requires staff to review and approve the final design of the pavers prior to the release of a zoning permit. This will ensure that the pavers being used are not the type that have grass growing through, but will look like decorative accent features (similar to those in the picture to the right, taken from the parking lot at Spring Hill Suites).
Parking

Hotels should provide one parking space for every guest room, one parking space for every 20 guest rooms (to accommodate for staff) plus one space per 250 square feet of public meeting area and/or restaurant space. Based on information provided by the applicant, 112 off-street parking spaces are required. The proposed site plan includes 107 off-street spaces, five of which are designated as handicap accessible. Based on a strict interpretation of the Zoning Code, they are deficient by five parking spaces. However, being a PUD, there is opportunity for some flexibility. Attached to the staff report is a parking study done by the operators of Spring Hill Suites, showing that on average 59.9% of the parking lot is being used, and based on their count, never was the parking lot full. Even on times where there was 100% occupancy, 20% of the parking lot empty, which, according to the applicant was counted at 11 PM each night. This would lead one to the conclusion that there is some room for overflow parking for the proposed hotel at the existing hotel. Staff has added a condition that requires cross parking between this property and the hotel to the west.

Building Design

Again, the applicant is proposing a 5-story, 107-room hotel. The proposed building is (at its widest) 93 feet wide, 181 feet long, and is approximately 60 feet to the top of the parapet cornice roof; and 72 feet to the top of the accent beacon. The proposed building will be approximately 59.7 feet from the southern property line, 39.8 feet from the eastern property line, 135 feet from the western property line, and about 400 feet from the Mall Ring Road. The proposed building will be constructed of a mix of EIFS molded into a brick pattern, cast stone and solid EIFS panels. On all four elevations, the first floor will be constructed of a tan cast stone. This gives the building a base wrapping the entire building and breaks up the elevations into layers. The remainder of the elevations are proposed primarily to be red EIFS cast in a brick pattern, with light grey EIFS accent bands. On three of the elevation, most prominently on the northern elevation, is dark brown EIFS paneling, with a green fine finish reveal EIFS accents. The highest point of the building will be an internally lit “Beacon” translucent glass accent feature, which will be unique to the area. This will be a static light feature not blinking or rotating. An example picture of the beacon feature is shown in the picture to the right.

Along the eastern property line, there is a proposed generator that is shown to be set back off the property line by less than one foot. Staff has concerns with this being too close to the property line, and the applicant is working to locate this further off the property line. A condition
has been added that the final location of the generator be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department prior to the release of a zoning permit.

Lighting

A lighting plan has also been included in the packet for your consideration. The site plan does show the installation of seven, 19.5-foot light fixtures with LED lights, around the perimeter of the parking lot and in the landscape islands. Also shown are 15 LED illuminated bollards, one LED wall pack light fixture and 12 canopy lights under the porte cochere and entrance canopies. Staff has added a condition that requires a final photometric plan be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department prior to the issuance of a zoning permit for this PUD. Further, the conditions require that all light fixtures be full cut-off, and canopy lighting be completely recessed.

Stormwater Management

All concerns of the City Engineer regarding stormwater management shall be addressed prior to the release of the record plat for recording. The applicant will be utilizing the existing stormwater retention ponds in front of the Mall at Fairfield Commons for their general stormwater needs, and will create a first flush EPA water quality pond on site.

Landscaping

As noted on pages L1.0 and L1.1 in your packet, the applicant is proposing a good investment in landscaping on the site. They show the use of evergreen trees and shrubs, as well as abundant amounts of decorative shrubs, grasses and ornamental/shade trees. Staff has no concerns with the proposed design or scope of the preliminary landscaping plan. A condition has been added that the final landscape plan be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department prior to the release of the zoning permit for the project.

Signage

The applicant is proposing two wall signs with this application. The proposed wall sign on the western elevation is approximately 9 feet x 4.5 feet (40.5 square feet) is internally lit, and will be individual channel letters (not on a raceway). This sign will be on the 5th floor, 50 feet above grade. The proposed wall sign on the northern elevation is approximately 16.5 feet x 8 feet (132 square feet) is internally lit, and will be individual channel letters (not on a raceway). This sign will be on the 5th floor, also 50 feet above grade.

No additional ground signs have been submitted with this application. The staff has added a stipulation that the applicant may utilize a part or all of the un-built 6-foot ground sign that was approved, but never constructed, for the Spring Hill Suites.
RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of this major modification to the approved specific site plan request subject to the conditions outlined in the attached Resolution.
RESOLUTION

CITY OF BEAVERCREEK
PLANNING COMMISSION
September 7, 2017

RE: PUD 13-4 MOD 8/17
Home2 Suites by Hilton

WHEREAS, HiFive Development Services, 202 West Main Street, Mason Ohio 45040, has filed an application requesting major modification for 1.8179 acres of land for the construction of a 5-story, 107-room hotel located on the south side of Commons Boulevard, further described as Book 4, Page 3, Parcel 63 on the tax maps of Greene County, Ohio; and

WHEREAS, public hearing was held on September 7, 2017 by the Beavercreek Planning Commission at which time all people who wished to testify gave their comments at the public hearing; and

WHEREAS, the Beavercreek Planning Commission finds that the facts submitted with this PUD Major Modification application and presented at the public hearing and any modifications, amendments, or supplementary conditions satisfy the standards and criteria for PUD Major Modification approval as per §158.070 of the Zoning Code; and

WHEREAS, the Beavercreek Planning Commission is taking administrative action in recommending approval of this PUD Major Modification.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED,

SECTION I

The Beavercreek Planning Commission recommends to Beavercreek City Council approval of this Major Modification to the Specific Site Plan for the Mall Keepers PUD with the following conditions and requirements.

SECTION II

1. The approved site and architectural plans shall be the plans dated “Received August 4, 2017” except as modified herein.

2. All building mechanical equipment is to be completely screened from all directions with architectural features (roof forms or parapet walls) on each building. Metal screening will not be accepted. Pad mounted equipment
must be screened with landscaping and/or masonry walls and shall not be visible to the public. The final screening design and materials shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department, prior to the release of a zoning permit for the project.

3. A PUD Agreement must be signed by the owner and a bond or letter of credit for the site landscaping must be submitted prior to issuance of a zoning permit for any portion of the project for the purpose, but not for the sole purpose, of insuring the installation of landscaping. Said bond or letter of credit must meet the requirements of the City's landscaping and screening regulations.

4. Perpetual maintenance of landscaping shall be provided and any dead or diseased materials shall be removed and replaced with similar types, species and sizes, as originally planted, within three months weather permitting.

5. All trash collection containers shall be enclosed within a building or screened from view and enclosed within a permanent dumpster enclosure. All dumpster enclosures shall be constructed with materials to match the building. The final location of the dumpster shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Zoning Department prior to the issuance of a zoning permit.

6. Debris and trash shall be routinely collected by the owner from the parking lot and grounds of all areas of the project including the storm drainage facilities. The City reserves the right to require more frequent collection as necessary.

7. All concerns of the City Engineer, Fire Department, Sanitary Engineer and the Planning Department shall be addressed and approved prior to the release of a zoning permit.

8. All man-doors and service doors shall be painted to match the color of the building as to blend in with the proposed facade.

9. Downspouts shall be internally mounted and shall not be visible on the exterior of the principal structure within this development except as specifically approved by the Planning Commission and/or Planning Department.

10. The final lighting plan and cut sheets shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department prior to the release of the record plan for recording. The fixtures shall be architecturally compatible with the fixtures used at Spring Hill Suites.
11. Final drainage calculations shall be approved by the City Engineer prior to the release of zoning permit.

12. Prior to the issuance of a zoning permit for the project, the applicant shall submit a cross parking agreement between this property and the Spring Hill Suites to the west.

13. The final location of the generator shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department prior to the release of a zoning permit.

14. The final design of the pervious pavers shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department prior to the release of any zoning permit for the site.

15. The permitted wall sign on the western elevation shall be similar in size and location as the signs shown on the approved architectural elevations, as referenced in the staff report. All wall signs will be individual channel letters, raceways shall not be permitted.

16. No additional ground signs will be permitted with this application. The applicant may, however utilize a part or all of the never built 6-foot ground sign that was approved, but never constructed, for the Spring Hill Suites.

17. A stop bar shall be added at the egress/ingress point. The final location shall be subject to review and approval by the City Engineer prior to the release of a Zoning Permit.

SECTION III

These plans and all papers relating to the approved plan shall be submitted with this Resolution to City Council.

The Clerk is directed to transmit this case to City Council for further determination as required by law.

ADOPTED:
VOTING FOR ADOPTION:
VOTING AGAINST:
ABSENT:

_________________________________________ Chairman

Attest:

PUD 13-4 MOD 8-17 Home2 Suites by Hilton Resolution
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Hotel Occupancy</th>
<th>Total # Of Empty Spots</th>
<th># Of Empty ADA Spots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08/10/17</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/11/17</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/12/17</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/13/17</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/14/17</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/15/17</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/16/17</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/17/17</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/18/17</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/19/17</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/20/17</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/21/17</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/22/17</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/23/17</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/24/17</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/25/17</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/26/17</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/27/17</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/28/17</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/29/17</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/30/17</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/31/17</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*provided by the applicant, time taken was 11:00 PM-11:30PM
CITY OF BEAVERCREEK
PLANNING COMMISSION
AGENDA ITEM REPORT

Meeting Date: September 7, 2017
Agenda Reference No.
Reference Topic: PUD 88-18 MOD 8/17 (Major)
BSM Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION REQUESTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X] Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Disapproval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Review and Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] No Action Requested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REQUEST BY APPLICANT:

The applicant is requesting approval of a modification to Beavercreek Towne Centre, PUD 88-18, to allow for an approximately 4,000 square foot addition to the former Logan's Roadhouse restaurant as well as additional exterior renovations to the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff is recommending approval of this major modification as outlined in the attached Resolution.

PROCEDURAL OPTIONS FOLLOWING ACTION:

The Planning Commission may choose to recommend approval, disapproval, modification or table the attached application for further review.

Pereira
PROJECT: BSM Development
CASE NO.: PUD 88-18 MOD 8-17 (Major)
APPLICANT: CESO Inc
8534 Yankee St. Suite 2B
Dayton OH 45458

REQUEST

The applicant is requesting approval of a modification to Beavercreek Towne Centre, PUD 88-18, to allow for an approximately 4,000 square foot addition to the former Logan’s Roadhouse restaurant as well as additional exterior renovations to the building.

ANALYSIS

Logan’s Roadhouse received approval from Planning Commission in 2005 for an approximately 8,000 square foot restaurant but closed its doors in 2016. This proposal would permit an additional 4,000 square feet to be added on to the vacant restaurant in order to convert the building into a multi-tenant use. The applicant is anticipating two restaurant tenants, totaling 8,427 square feet, on each end and 3,591 square feet of retail space. A 1,284 square foot outdoor patio and a drive thru window are also being proposed.

Elevations

The proposed elevations are consistent with the standards of new development within the
City of Beavercreek. The applicant is proposing a mix of materials consisting primarily of brick, stone and EIFS which will be an attractive addition to the area. The architecture is four sided with the rear of the building consisting almost entirely of brick. Conditions of approval will ensure that all roof top units or ground mounted equipment be adequately screened and all downspouts be internally mounted.

Parking

When this site was approved as a Logan’s Roadhouse restaurant, the parking lot originally contained 141 parking spaces, but with this modification some of those will need to be removed for the expansion. The applicant is anticipating 7,163 square feet of restaurant and 3,053 square feet of retail, after the 15% reduction for areas like bathrooms, hallways, and stockrooms. The zoning code requires 120 spaces for these two uses. The applicant is providing 131 spaces including five handicap spaces.

Screening, Landscaping

The applicant has provided a landscape plan that shows a significant amount of new trees, grasses, and shrubs to supplement those that are already existing on site. A condition of approval will require that any dead or dying vegetation be removed and any existing vegetation be trimmed back and properly maintained.

Lighting

Only one new light pole is being proposed on the western end of the building closest to the new addition. The rest of the light poles are existing and will remain. A condition of approval will require that the new pole match in fixture size, design, and height those on site. The photometric plan that has been included in the packet complies with lighting requirements.

Signage

Wall signage shall adhere to the B-3 standards of the zoning code, 1.5 square feet of signage per linear foot of tenant frontage, and shall be conditioned as such. The maximum allowed wall signage for the entire building shall be 250 square feet and no signage shall be permitted at the rear (the south elevation) of the building. If the applicant chooses to install a ground sign it shall be limited to a maximum of 40 square feet in sign area per side and a maximum height of five feet. The final design and location of all signage shall be reviewed and approved by staff.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on this analysis, staff recommends approval of this request subject to the conditions outlined in the attached resolution.
RESOLUTION

CITY OF BEAVERCREEK
PLANNING COMMISSION
September 7, 2017

RE: PUD 88-18 MOD 8/17
BSM Development

WHEREAS, agent for the owner, CESO Inc, 8534 Yankee Street Suite 2B, Dayton, Ohio, 45458, has filed an application requesting a major modification for 2.317 acres of land to allow for the construction of approximately a 4,000 square foot addition to the existing building to accommodate up to four retail/restaurant tenants located at 2819 Centre Drive, further described as Book 4, Page 2, Parcel 12 on the tax maps of Greene County, Ohio; and

WHEREAS, public hearing was held on September 7, 2017 by the Beavercreek Planning Commission at which time all people who wished to testify gave their comments at the public hearing; and

WHEREAS, the Beavercreek Planning Commission finds that the facts submitted with this PUD Major Modification application and presented at the public hearing and any modifications, amendments, or supplementary conditions satisfy the standards and criteria for PUD Major Modification approval as per §158.070 of the Zoning Code; and

WHEREAS, the Beavercreek Planning Commission is taking administrative action in recommending approval of this PUD Major Modification.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED,

SECTION I

The Beavercreek Planning Commission recommends to Beavercreek City Council approval of this Major Modification to the Specific Site Plan for PUD 88-18 with the following conditions and requirements.

SECTION II

1. The approved site and architectural plans shall be the plans dated “Received August 3, 2017 except as modified herein.

2. All building mechanical equipment is to be completely screened from all directions with architectural features (roof forms or parapet walls) on each
building. Metal screening will not be accepted. Pad mounted equipment must be screened with landscaping and/or masonry walls and shall not be visible to the public. The final screening design and materials shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department, prior to the release of a zoning permit for the project.

3. A PUD Agreement must be signed by the owner and a bond or letter of credit for the site landscaping must be submitted prior to issuance of a zoning permit for any portion of the project for the purpose, but not for the sole purpose, of insuring the installation of landscaping. Said bond or letter of credit must meet the requirements of the City's landscaping and screening regulations.

4. Perpetual maintenance of landscaping shall be provided and any dead or diseased materials shall be removed and replaced with similar types, species and sizes, as originally planted, within three months weather permitting.

5. All trash collection containers shall be enclosed within a building or screened from view and enclosed within a permanent dumpster enclosure. All dumpster enclosures shall be constructed with materials to match the building. The final location of the dumpster shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Zoning Department prior to the issuance of a zoning permit.

6. Debris and trash shall be routinely collected by the owner from the parking lot and grounds of all areas of the project including the storm drainage facilities. The City reserves the right to require more frequent collection as necessary.

7. All concerns of the City Engineer, Fire Department, Sanitary Engineer and the Planning Department shall be addressed and approved prior to the release of a zoning permit.

8. All man-doors and service doors shall be painted to match the color of the building as to blend in with the proposed facade.

9. Downspouts shall be internally mounted and shall not be visible on the exterior of the principal structure within this development except as specifically approved by the Planning Commission and/or Planning Department.

10. The final lighting plan and cut sheets shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department prior to the release of the record plan for
recording. New fixtures shall be architecturally compatible with the fixtures existing on site.

11. Wall signage shall be limited to 1.5 square feet of sign area for each linear foot of tenant frontage with a maximum square footage of 250 square feet for the entire building and letters no taller than 48". Raceways shall not be permitted. No signs shall be permitted on the south elevation with the exception of signage to identify rear delivery doors.

12. One monument sign shall be permitted with a maximum of 40 square feet in sign area per side and a maximum of 5 feet in height. A base and wrap consisting of materials that match the building shall be required. The final design and location of the ground sign shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Zoning Department prior to the release of zoning permits.

SECTION III

These plans and all papers relating to the approved plan shall be submitted with this Resolution to City Council.

The Clerk is directed to transmit this case to City Council for further determination as required by law.

ADOPTED:
VOTING FOR ADOPTION:
VOTING AGAINST:
ABSENT:

________________________________________
Chairman

Attest:
REQUEST BY APPLICANT:

The applicant is requesting approval for the rezoning of 0.986 acres from R-1A One Family Residential to RO-1 Residential Office. The property is currently for sale, and the purpose of the rezoning is to expand the property's potential buyers. The parcel is located at 3076 Dayton-Xenia Road, approximately 650 feet west of the intersection of Meadow Bridge and Dayton-Xenia Roads.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff is recommending approval of this application as outlined in the attached Resolution.

PROCEDURAL OPTIONS FOLLOWING ACTION:

The Planning Commission may choose to recommend approval, disapproval, or table the attached application for further review.
PROJECT: Kiser Rezoning

CASE NO.: Z 17-2

APPLICANT: Sabrina and Raymond Kiser
6903 US 68
Wilmington Ohio, OH 45177

REQUEST

The applicant is requesting approval for the rezoning of 0.986 acres from R-1A One Family Residential to RO-1 Residential Office. The property is currently for sale, and the purpose of the rezoning is to expand the property’s potential buyers. The parcel is located at 3076 Dayton-Xenia Road, approximately 650 feet west of the intersection of Meadow Bridge and Dayton-Xenia Roads.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Current Zoning and Use

As stated, the property is currently zoned R-1A One Family Residential. As evident on the aerial photo to the right, the property has a u-shaped driveway with two access points directly off of Dayton-Xenia Road. There is a 1,000 square foot house, built in 1952 near the southern end of the property, approximately 267 feet from the northern property line. The property has approximately 129 feet of frontage on Dayton-Xenia Road.
Land Use Plan

The Land Use Plan calls for residential office at the northwest corner of Hanes and Dayton-Xenia Road and to the west, including the property within this rezoning request. This designation is intended to provide an area of transition between a more intense business or office district, as has already been established along Dayton-Xenia Road in this part of the City, and the surrounding residential environment. The area is designated to provide local services to residents that live nearby as well as low intensity and small-scale office uses. The reuse of the existing residential structure as either an office or as a residence as being proposed by the applicant is exactly what the Land Use Plan for the City calls for in this location.

The property is located within DXPA 3, as such, any new construction, or significant alterations to existing structures, will be required to go through the ASRA (Administrative Site Plan Review and Approval) process, as outlined in 158.075. This means Planning Commission and City Council will review/approve a site plan, architectural elevations, landscaping, lighting...etc for any new buildings. When/if that were to occur any new structure will be required to be constructed to have the general characteristics of a residential structure.

Surrounding Zoning/Use

The subject property has R-1A to the east, west and south. To the north is PUD R 417. There are several other RO-1 properties in the area, fronting on Dayton-Xenia Road, as this is proposing to do.
Recommendation

Based on this analysis, staff recommends approval of this request subject to the conditions outlined in the attached Resolution.
RESOLUTION

CITY OF BEAVERCREEK
PLANNING COMMISSION
September 6, 2017

RE: Z-17-2
R-1A One Family Residential
District to RO-1 Residential
Office District

WHEREAS, Sabrina and Raymond Kiser, 6903 US 68 North, Wilmington
OH 45177, have filed an application requesting approval of an amendment of zoning
classification from R-1A One Family Residential District to RO-1 Residential Office
District for 0.986 acres of land, located at 3076 Dayton-Xenia Road, further described as
Book 5, Page 6, Parcel 22 on the property tax maps of Greene County, Ohio; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held on September 6, 2017 by the
Beavercreek Planning Commission at which time all people who wished to testify gave
their comments at the public hearing.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Commission
recommends to Beavercreek City Council the following:

A. That approximately 0.986 acres of land incorporated within this request
and known as B42000500060002200 and as further described in the attached Exhibit
A be rezoned to RO-1 Residential Office District.

The Clerk is directed to transmit this case to City Council for further
determination as required by law.

ADOPTED:

VOTING FOR ADOPTION:

AGAINST:

ABSENT:

__________________________ Chairman

Attest:

Z-17-2 Resolution
STAFF REPORT
FINAL SUBDIVISION REQUEST
RIPPLE GLENN SEC. 1 REPLAT
CASE NO. S 17-6

APPLICANT:      Kevin Bechtel
                3946 Indian Ripple Road
                Beavercreek OH 45440

ENGINEER/SURVEYOR:   The Reinke Group
                     959 Congress Park Drive
                     Centerville OH 45459

I. NATURE OF REQUEST

The applicant is requesting approval of a replat to the Ripple Glenn to create an additional lot on Harbert Drive.

II. DISCUSSION

As shown in the aerial photo to the right, the plat under discussion contains three separate lots totaling 4.6231 acres. The applicant is proposing to shift the lot lines south in order to create a new lot at the north. Each of the new lots will be approximately 1.12 acres with the corner lot along Indian Ripple Road being proposed at 1.25 acres.

The property is zoned Planned Unit Development 96-4 and this request adheres with the original zoning.

Comments were received from the various area agencies, utilities, and city departments commonly included in reviewing proposed plans during the record plan review process. The applicant has received approval or conditional approval from all entities that submitted comments. Those comments will need to be addressed prior to the release of the record plan.
III. RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of this final subdivision request subject to the following conditions, which must be addressed prior to release of the record plan:

1. The approved record plan shall be the plan stamped “Received August 3, 2017”, except as modified below.

2. All concerns and comments of the Planning and Zoning Department, City Engineer, Greene County Sanitary Engineering Department, Greene County Auditor, public utility providers, and the Beavercreek Township Fire Department shall be addressed and satisfied prior to release of the record plan for recording.

3. Prior to release of the record plan for recording, the applicant shall provide a digital format file of the subdivision in Autocad or .dxf format.
We, the undersigned, being all the owners and lien holders of the land herein platted, have signed this record plat as evidence of our agreement and covenant to the City of Beavercreek to maintain and not interfere with all of the approved stormwater facilities on the property and to authorize the City of Beavercreek the right to enter upon the lands to restore, repair and replace said stormwater facilities as reasonably necessary to preserve their value and beneficial appearance; if, after notice, the owners, successors or assigns fail to do so and to assure it's cost to the real estate to be collected as taxes.

Covenant shown on the plat are for the construction, operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, or removal of water lines, gas lines, storm sewer drainage, sanitary sewer, electric, telephone, television or other utilities or services, and for the express privilege of removing any and all trees or other obstructions to the free use of said utilities and for providing for ingress and egress to the property for said purpose, and are to be maintained as such forever.

Streets shown on the plat are hereby dedicated to the public use forever.

OWNER
BECHTEL ASSOCIATES LTD.
(An Ohio Limited Liability Company)
Charles L. Bechtel
Managing Partner
Kevin L. Bechtel
Partner

STATE OF OHIO, S.S.

Be it remembered that on this day of 2017, before me the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for said county and state, personally came Bechtel Associates Ltd., by Charles L. Bechtel, its Managing Partner, and Kevin L. Bechtel, its Partner, who acknowledged the signing and execution of the foregoing instrument to be their voluntary act and deed.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notary seal on the day and year last aforesaid.

Notary Public

STATE OF OHIO, S.S.

Charles L. Bechtel, being duly sworn, says that all persons and corporations, to the best of his knowledge, interested in this dedication, either as owners or lienholders, have united in its execution.

Charles L. Bechtel
Managing Partner

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and notary seal on the day and year last aforesaid.

Notary Public

RE-PLAT
RIPPLE GLENN
SECTION ONE
LOTS #7-#9 AS RECORDED IN
P.C. 36, PG. 1048-1054
LOCATED IN:
SECTIONS 5 & 6, TOWN 2, RANGE 8, M.R.
CITY OF BEAVERCREEK
GREENE COUNTY, OHIO
CONTAINING: 4.6231 AC.
JULY 20, 2017

DESCRIPTION
Situated in Sections 5 & 6, Town 2, Range 8, M.R., City of Beavercreek, County of Greene, and being a Re-Plat of Lots #7 thru #9 of Ripple Glen Section One Re-Plat, as recorded in P.C. 36, Page 5218-5223, in the Plat records of Greene County, Ohio.

APPROVAL
( FOR STREET AND PLAT RECORDING )
Approved by the Planning Commission of the City of Beavercreek, Ohio on June 1, 2017.

Planning Commission Chairman
Planning Department Director

Transferred this day of 2017.
Greene County Auditor

File No. Plat Book Pages
Received for Record this day of 2016 at M.

Recorded this day of 2017.
Greene County Recorder

CERTIFICATION
The within plat is a Re-Plat containing 4.6231 Ac., being all of Lots #7 thru #9 of Ripple Glen Section One Re-Plat, as recorded in P.C. 36, Pg. 1048-1054 in the Plat Records of Greene County, Ohio.

The plot represents a survey by The Reiske Group, Inc., and that all existing monuments indicated therein actually exist and their location, size and marking is correctly shown.

That in my professional opinion all requirements of these subdivision rules have been fully complied with.

The measurements are certified correct; monuments and iron pins will be set as shown upon completion of construction. Curve distances are measured on the arc.

THE REISKE GROUP, INC.

Louie J. Hanes, Ohio Registered Surveyor No. 7843

COVENANTS, CONDITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS
The within subdivision will be subject to the Declaration of Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions for Ripple Glen Subdivision Park as recorded in the Official Records of Greene County, Ohio in Ord. 1217, Pg. 299.