

BEAVERCREEK PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING, April 7, 2021

PRESENT: Mr. Ayers, Mr. Hight, Mr. Loftis, Mr. Meyer, Mr. Self

ABSENT: None

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

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

REORGANIZATION

Chairman

Mr. Loftis nominated Mr. Self as chairman. Motion was seconded by Mr. Hight. Mr. Self was appointed chairman by unanimous voice vote.

Vice Chairman

Mr. Hight nominated Mr. Loftis as vice chairman. Motion was seconded by Mr. Ayers. Mr. Loftis was appointed vice chairman by unanimous voice vote.

Mr. Ayers MOVED approval of the February 3, 2021 minutes. Motion was seconded by Mr. Loftis and PASSED by majority voice vote. (Self abstained)

PUBLIC HEARINGS

PUD 06-6 SSP #4, Mission Point Buildings A & B

Clerk Gillaugh read the public notice on an application filed by Woodard Development, 205 East 1st Street, Dayton, OH 45402. The applicant requests specific site plan approval to allow for the construction of a three-story 82,500 square foot office and research facility and a two-story 55,000 square foot office and research facility on 10.99 acres. The property is located on the east side of Mission Point Boulevard, approximately 200 feet south of Colonel Glenn Highway further described as Book 1, Page 3, part of Parcel 2 on the Greene County Property Tax Atlas.

Jason Woodard, Woodard Development, stated they have reviewed the staff report and resolution and were available for questions.

Ms. Pereira summarized the staff report dated March 30, 2021, which stated the applicant is requesting to construct two office buildings within the Mission Point development. She discussed the location of the property, what currently exists on the property, the building renderings, the building materials, the access points, the parking requirements, the stormwater management, the landscaping requirements, the lighting requirements, and the signage requirements. Staff recommended approval of the case with 19 conditions.

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

BEAVERCREEK PLANNING COMMISSION, 4/7/2021

Mr. Self asked where the additional parking spaces would be located. Ms. Pereira explained they would be on the south side.

Mr. Ayers MOVED to approve PUD 06-6 SSP #4 with 19 conditions:

1. The approved plans shall be those plans dated "Received March 4 2021" except as modified herein.
2. The approved building elevations shall be those plans stamped "Received March 31, 2021" except where modified herein.
3. All building mechanical equipment is to be screened from all directions with architectural features (roof forms or parapet walls) of 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.
4. A PUD Agreement must be signed by the owner and a bond or letter of credit for Specific Site Plan #4 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.
5. 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.
6. All trash collection containers shall be enclosed within a building or screened from view and enclosed within a permanent gated dumpster enclosure. Any dumpster enclosures shall be constructed with materials to match the building.
7. 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.
8. All light fixtures and related illumination of the site must meet the conditions outlined in the Zoning Code. A detailed cut sheet and photometric plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department prior to the release of a zoning permit for the building. Light poles shall be installed within landscape islands only and lights in the parking lot shall be reduced to no greater than 25 percent illumination level within one hour after closing.
9. 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.

10. No temporary signs of any kind will be permitted within this PUD unless otherwise approved by the Planning and Development Department and or Planning Commission.
11. The façade shall not be painted or altered without the express permission of the Planning Department and/or Planning Commission.
12. A detailed landscape plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning and Development Department prior to the execution of the required PUD Agreement and release of a zoning permit for the building.
13. Final drainage calculations shall be approved by the City Engineer prior to the release of the record plat for recording.
14. The Applicant shall submit a final subdivision record plan, showing cross access to future development to the east, which is to be reviewed and approved by the City Planning Commission, prior to the release of a zoning permit for either building.
15. Fountains and/or other aeration and water circulation devices are required for the retention ponds and shall be maintained by the owner, developer, or the condo association in perpetuity.
16. Should staff find that the approved number of parking spaces is insufficient, the proposed parking area at the southeastern corner of the property shall be constructed with additional landscaping consistent with the approved landscape plan.
17. Scuppers and downspouts will not be visible on the exterior of the building.
18. Signage shall be limited to 300 square feet on the long elevations of either building and 150 square feet on the short elevations, with no single sign on any elevation exceeding 75 square feet. The final design and location of each sign shall be reviewed and approved at the permitting stage by the Planning and Development Department. No raceways are permitted.
19. One bike rack, of applicants choice, shall be installed in front of each of the buildings.

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

PUD 21-2 & PUD 21-2 SSP #1

Sky Crossing Rezoning & Specific Site Plan

Clerk Gillaugh read the public notice on an application filed by M/I Homes, 9349 Waterstone Blvd., Ste. 100, Cincinnati, OH 45249. The application requests approval to rezone 81.66 acres from PUD B-398 (B3), Planned Unit Development to R-PUD, Residential Planned Unit Development and approval of a specific site plan to allow development of 146 single-family residential homes. The property is located on the south

side of Shakertown Road west of North Alpha Bellbrook Road further described as Book 6, Page 16, part of Parcel 1 on the Greene County Property Tax Atlas.

Mr. Loftis, Mr. Hight, and Mr. Ayers recused themselves from the case.

Mr. McHugh explained this is an extremely unusual situation. He said procedurally the Planning Commission adopts either motions or resolutions, and both are recommendations. Mr. McHugh stated both of these cases would end up at City Council because that is where the final decision is made. He said with the Commission now down to two members who do not have to recuse, they are going to have to have two members vote on this matter. Mr. McHugh explained the rules provide first that a majority vote of the members would be needed, however, since there are only two members voting the motion would die. He said at that point they would have to switch to a different standard that states the majority of the voting members and that would be the decision of the Planning Commission, which would then go to Council.

Brad Austing, M/I Homes, stated they are excited to be back before the City with another project. He discussed the history of M/I Homes, the M/I warranty commitment, their current 21 active communities, the site plan, the monument signage, the community details, the proposed 37 acres of greenspace, the landscaping plan, the pricing range, and the house plans and elevations.

Mr. Burkett summarized the staff reports dated April 2, 2021, which stated the applicant is requesting to rezone the 81.66 acres to construct 146 single family homes. He discussed the location of the property, the average square footage of the proposed homes, the price range of the homes, what currently exists on the site, the current zoning classification and the current permitted uses, the Land Use Plan designation, the proposed permitted uses, the proposed site plan, the building setbacks, the proposed access points, the right-of-way of the streets, the retention pond locations, the proposed tree line, the three phases of the project, the architectural elevations of the homes, the landscaping plan, and the proposed ground signage. Mr. Burkett discussed several conditions in the resolution of the rezoning case and the specific site plan case. He reviewed the traffic differences between what is currently allowed to be built on site and the proposed case. Staff recommended approval of the rezoning case with nine conditions and recommended approval of the specific site plan case with 28 conditions.

In public input for the rezoning case, Keith Drew Ayers, 2725 Stauffer Drive, thought the rezoning was a good measure because there are many uses that could potentially go in right now and thought changing it to fit the surrounding area is a good plan. He referred to Condition #3 and thought the number was deceptive in the fact that M/I Homes is only planning to build on approximately 55% of the land. Mr. Ayers said with that calculation it puts them above the low-density ratio, and thought how density is determined the unit dwellings per acre is up to interpretation but is deceptive.

There being no further public input on the rezoning case the public hearing was closed.

Mr. Meyer asked how the density has been calculated in the past with single family home developments. Mr. Burkett explained the calculation is based on the overall land and the number of units.

Mr. Self asked what the percentage of open space is versus platted out lots. Mr. Burkett explained this is higher than what is typically seen. He said this is only the second one he has seen since he started here in 2006. Mr. Burkett explained there is a minimum requirement for pervious surface in a residential development and those requirements have been met. Mr. Self thought the percentage seemed to be higher than they normally see. Mr. Burkett agreed it is.

Mr. Self MOVED to approve PUD 21-2 with 9 conditions. Motion was seconded by Mr. Meyer. Motion FAILED by a roll call vote of 2-0. (Only two members voting, Ayers, Hight and Loftis recused) [See Chapter 158.171 (D)(1)]

Per Chapter 158.171 (D)(2), Mr. Self MOVED to approve PUD 21-2 with 9 conditions:

1. The specific site plan shall generally conform to the plans stamped "Received March 18, 2021" except as modified herein.
2. Principal and accessory uses permitted in this Residential Planned Unit Development shall be those principal, conditional, and accessory uses permitted in R-1A zoning districts.
3. Maximum density for this R- PUD shall be 1.8 dwelling units per acre.
4. Lots shall be a minimum of 60 feet wide.
5. Any proposed lots which are directly adjacent to R-1B residential lots, shall be a minimum 16,000 square feet.
6. 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-1B lots, which shall be a minimum of 40-foot rear yard setback.
 - c) 5-foot minimum side yard. No principle structures shall be closer than 15 feet to each other. For lots abutting existing R-1B lots, there shall be a minimum 10-foot side yard setback on both sides of each house.
7. 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.
8. Building plans, designs and elevations for residential structures within this project

BEAVERCREEK PLANNING COMMISSION, 4/7/2021

shall be subject to review and approval by Planning Commission and City Council at specific site plan stage.

9. 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. Meyer. Motion PASSED by a roll call vote of 2-0. (Ayers, Hight and Loftis recused)

In public input for the specific site plan case, Dwayne Carr, 604 Brookmeade Court, stated his property would back up to Lot 114, and was concerned with the water runoff on the hill because they get a fair share of water now if it is a heavy rain.

Charles Rigano, 548 Calumet Place, referred to the tree line along the west side and said it goes on the individual properties. He stated the homeowner can do as he/she wants with the property once they have purchased it, and could take down trees if they wanted to. He proposed having the tree line as part of the HOA property and not on the individual properties. Mr. Rigano asked how the open space land will be finished or if there was a requirement for them to finish it a certain way. He questioned if there was an intent for the developer to build more there or if this was the full intent the builder was going to use the land for. Mr. Rigano referred to the current tree area to the south of the proposed lots, and questioned if they were going to take down a considerable amount of the trees and make it open space. He said if that was the case it would impact him significantly because he has several 100 feet of woods behind him now.

Thomas Morrill, 2784 Stauffer Drive, stated his concerns are with water flow, the houses moving due to the ground shifting, and the environmental impacts this will cause with the wildlife. He did not feel all of the trees needed to be cut down in the southwestern portion of the lot and along Shakertown Road. Mr. Morrill stated with the commercial zoning there was a 50-foot buffer, but with the residential zoning there is 25 feet and it did not make sense to him. He thought maybe an easement could be added to prevent the 25-foot tree line from being cut down, and said the trees were a big reason why they retired in Beaver Creek and the location they bought their home.

John Petty, 2804 Stauffer Drive, stated he is concerned with the water run-off, the land shifting, and the environment. He was worried about coyotes, and thought a larger setback would be nice. Mr. Petty was concerned about the impact this would have on traffic and the schools.

Nathan Baker, 596 Brookmeade Court, stated he opposed this request. He was concerned with the capacity of the Beaver Creek schools. Mr. Baker was apprehensive with the developer starting this new development when the current Cedarbrook development is not finished yet, and thought a new development should not be started until the other one has been completed.

BEAVERCREEK PLANNING COMMISSION, 4/7/2021

Drew Ayers, 2725 Stauffer Drive, said following up on a question Mr. Self asked staff talking about the extra land, to clarify he thought it would be impossible to build on any of the other acreage because of the grading restraints. He felt one way they could mitigate the removal of trees and try to keep some of the natural state would be to install a retaining wall that would run along the southwest corner of the property. Mr. Ayers asked if there was a lighting plan. He asked that the lot size be increased to where the minimum lot size would be a 0.25-acre. Mr. Ayers said where the sign was proposed off North Alpha-Bellbrook Road, as well as Lot 1 and Lot 2, was existing wetlands and wanted to see that preserved. He stated if the project did move forward, he requested that no temporary signage be permitted. Mr. Ayers wanted to make sure the roads would be clear of dirt, and asked that a bond be required for street cleaning. He referred to the monument signs, and wanted to make sure the materials used would be low maintenance.

Nick Loftis, 2906 Stauffer Drive, stated his main concern was not to specific to this development but specifically to the liabilities of the additional road building is going to cause the City. He discussed how many miles of roads the City of Beavercreek currently has, and the City Engineer's percentage goal is for resurfacing each year. Mr. Loftis gave some figures based off the next 10 years, and questioned how the City would pay for the roads in the long term while they still have infrastructure problems in the near term. He thought that maybe it was through a moratorium, an income tax or other funding means. Mr. Loftis explained the difference in how the City repairs/replaces roadways versus the bare minimum requirements that the developers are expected to meet.

Carl Kobza, 2794 Stauffer Drive, stated he was concerned about the buildable area, the grading, the northeast floodplain area, and the destroying of the forest area. He believed the 25-foot tree area was not much of a buffer. He was worried about traffic and the schools.

In written input, eight letters were received expressing their concerns and requesting the case not be approved. The letters were received from Alexandra Riggs, Amber Groshans, Jeremy & Anissa Bell, Kevin Cozart, M.F. Tedesco, Erin Snider, Judy Patak, and Sabrina Jackson.

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

Mr. Meyer asked staff to discuss the floodplain area, and asked when they design the detention pond sizes if the floodplain area comes into play. Mr. Burkett explained the area being rezoned does not incorporate the floodplain. Mr. Meyer asked Mr. Burkett to explain the City's water runoff requirements post development. Mr. Burkett explained the City has a stormwater ordinance that requires the runoff from the development cannot increase any more than pre-development. Mr. Meyer asked what staff's opinion was of incorporating the tree line into the HOA property, and questioned if it had been done at any other developments in the City. Mr. Burkett explained another development where something similar was done with the HOA, but it was important that the lots abutting the existing

residential properties meet the lot size requirements. He said whomever buys that lot will have the ability to cut the trees down if they choose, but he thought they would want to keep them as a buffer too. Mr. Burkett stated there are also several developments that have no-cut zones, and discussed the issues the City has faced with those.

Mr. Meyer asked if the setback along the western portion was originally 20 feet, but now it has been increased to 25 feet. Mr. Burkett explained there is no buffering requirements between two single-family residential developments. He said the 25-foot tree line is above and beyond what is typically required for a single-family development. Mr. Meyer asked if the monument sign was compatible to what was built at Cedarbrook. Mr. Burkett said yes.

Mr. Self asked if the waterflow was from southwest to northeast on this property. Mr. Burkett stated that was correct. Mr. Self questioned if the existing residential properties to the west and to the south were higher than the proposed development. Mr. Burkett said towards the south it is much higher but the proposed site is lower. Mr. Self asked about the street lights. Mr. Burkett explained there was a condition that each lot have a small lamp. Mr. Self questioned if the City was requiring the intersection to be lit. Mr. Burkett said there is a condition regarding all the requirements of the Engineering Department be met and typically there are street lights at the main roads.

Mr. Self asked if there was a left turn lane west bound at Shakertown Road and North Fairfield Road and also at Shakertown Road and North Alpha-Bellbrook Road. Mr. Moorman stated in 2022 there would be a road project on Shakertown Road and explained what the project would entail. Mr. Self asked if the lot sizes were similar to Cedarbrook Farm. Mr. Burkett stated they were slightly smaller, but this development has a lot more open space. Mr. Self asked according to our Zoning Code if it was legal for the City to deny a development because of the possible effect on the school system or on the roads. Mr. McHugh stated no the City could not in regards to the schools, and in terms of the roads it could only be for the need of a turn lane, acceleration lane, etc. He said the overall condition of roads though would be difficult to prove they are related to one development and would likely be the accumulation of multiple developments. Mr. McHugh stated that is the reason they have the property taxes to deal with the roads.

Mr. Self asked if all the lots met the minimum street frontage. Mr. Burkett said yes, and explained how the measurement is calculated on the pie shaped cul-de-sac lots. Mr. Self referred to the easement on the gas line, and questioned if it met the standards of the gas company. Mr. Burkett explained they set that up in the 1950's and there is a requirement that nothing can be placed on the easement.

Mr. Self said there was a lot of concern in regards to the existing trees and the tree line specifically in the southwest corner of the property. Mr. Austing showed the grading plan, and explained they are trying to save as many trees as they can. Mr. Self asked what was going to be done after it has been graded to keep it from washing out while the development is underway. Mr. Austing explained there is a requirement that it is vegetated post construction and long term, and they will have to maintain erosion. Mr. Self asked if

the catch basins were going to be through the greenspace and not through the lots. Mr. Austing said the water would flow down towards the detention ponds, and the exact lines will be part of the technical review with the City Engineer. Mr. Self questioned if the floodplain area could ever be built on. Mr. Burkett said it could be, and discussed what the requirements would be to build there.

Mr. Meyer asked what type of temporary signage was allowed. Mr. Burkett explained what was permitted. Mr. Meyer referred to the lots on the west side, and questioned how far back the homes will be set. Mr. Austing explained the houses would be set on the front yard setback line. Mr. Meyer questioned how wide the houses were in the development. Mr. Austing said approximately 40 to 50 feet.

Mr. Meyer MOVED to approve PUD 21-2 SSP #1 with 28 conditions. Motion was seconded by Mr. Self. Motion FAILED by a roll call vote of 2-0. (Only two members voting, Ayers, Hight and Loftis recused) [See Chapter 158.171 (D)(1)]

Per Chapter 158.171 (D)(2), Mr. Self MOVED to approve PUD 21-2 SSP #1 with 28 conditions:

1. The approved site and landscape plans shall be the plans dated "Received April 1, 2021" except as modified herein.
2. Hours of construction for any grading and exterior work associated with this development shall be limited to Monday through Saturday from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m.
3. Prior to issuance of any zoning permits for the project, the applicant shall submit a subdivision record plan for City approval.
4. Prior to the release of the subdivision for recording, the applicant shall sign a Subdivider's Contract on forms provided by the City and provide a bond or letter of credit for the required public improvements.
5. A PUD Agreement, acceptable to the City, 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 city's landscaping and screening regulations.
6. Perpetual maintenance of landscaping planted in all common areas shall be provided and any dead or diseased materials shall be removed and replaced by the homeowner's associations with similar types, species and sizes, as originally planted, within three months of their removal, weather permitting.

BEAVERCREEK PLANNING COMMISSION, 4/7/2021

7. There shall be one tree provided for each individual buildable lot, which shall be planted between the sidewalk and the front of the house. These trees shall be maintained by the respective property owner, and replaced if dead or dying.
8. Prior to release of the subdivision for recording, all concerns and comments of the City Engineer, the Beavercreek Fire Department, and Sanitary Engineer shall be addressed and satisfied.
9. Prior to the release of the subdivision, the applicant shall submit a copy of the covenants, restrictions, and homeowner's association documents to the City of Beavercreek for this subdivision, which shall, among other provisions, provide provisions for maintenance and landscaping of common areas, communal mail facilities and the storm water ponds. The covenants, restrictions and homeowner's association documents, shall be reviewed and approved by the City Attorney and be recorded with Greene County prior to the release of any zoning permit for the site. Said maintenance and landscaping shall be provided by the homeowners association in perpetuity.
10. Final entrance signs and the landscape plans for the entry features shall be approved by the Planning Department staff prior to any zoning permits being issued for the signs, but shall generally conform to those shown in Exhibit B.
11. One photoelectric light fixture shall be required for every lot with a residential structure.
12. Street lighting is subject to final approval of the Engineering Department prior to the release of the record plat for recording.
13. Final landscape plans are subject to final review and approval by the Planning Department prior to the release of a record plat for recording. Additional landscaping shall be added along Shakertown Road.
14. All concerns of the Beavercreek Fire Department and Sanitary Engineer must be addressed prior to the release of a record plat. All concerns of the City Engineer including but not limited to road improvements, land dedication, grading, stormwater management, and erosion control must be addressed prior to the release of a record plat.
15. The approved homes constructed within this development shall be generally consistent with the example homes shown in the attached Exhibit A. If needed, any disagreement between the Planning Department and the home builder as to what is considered "generally consistent" shall be decided by the Planning Commission.
16. The homes constructed within this development must consist of brick, stone and Hardie plank/cement board siding, and/or acrylic siding on all four sides of the

BEAVERCREEK PLANNING COMMISSION, 4/7/2021

building. The use of metal or vinyl sidings, including aluminum siding shall not be permitted except on fascia and soffit areas.

17. Any home builder other than M/I Homes must provide the Planning Department with samples of past construction, to ensure consistency with architectural requirements, prior to issuance of a zoning permit. If needed, any disagreement between the Planning Department and the home builder as to what is considered architecturally consistent shall be decided by the Planning Commission.
18. The use of chain linked fencing shall be prohibited in this development.
19. Aeration and water circulation devices and/or fountains are required to be installed into any retention pond and shall be maintained by the homeowner's association in perpetuity.
20. Any existing wells on site that will be closed off, shall be closed under appropriate ODNR methods.
21. The final design and placement of any common mailbox(es) shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Department prior to their placement.
22. Prior to any grading on site, the applicant shall install a temporary grading limit fence, 25 feet from the western property line, and 25 feet from the southern property line, as shown in Exhibit C. If any landscaping/grading is disturbed outside of the grading limit, the applicant shall submit and received approval of an amended landscape plan showing mitigation for the disturbed areas, and install said landscaping, prior to the release or reduction of any landscaping bonds.
23. Minimum Building Setbacks for this PUD are as follows:
 - 30-foot minimum front yard.
 - 35-foot minimum rear yard, except lots that abut existing R-1B lots, which shall be a minimum of 40-foot rear yard setback.
 - 5-foot minimum side yard; No principle structures shall be closer than 15 feet to each other. For lots abutting existing R-1B lots, there shall be a minimum 10-foot side yard setback on both sides of the house.
24. The minimum square footage for residential units shall be as follows:
 - One-story ranch units shall be a minimum 1,500 square feet excluding garages and porches.
 - Two-story units shall be a minimum 2,000 square feet excluding garages and porches.
 - Residential units on Lots 114 through 125 shall be a minimum of 2,600 square feet, excluding garages and porches.

25. All residential style trash totes shall be stored within or immediately adjacent to a primary structure, and shall be out of ordinary public view on days when trash collection is not occurring (except the night before scheduled pick-up is to occur)
26. Prior to the release of the record plan, park fees for each section shall be paid in-lieu of dedication of parkland for said section as determined at the subdivision stage.
27. This approval is contingent on the approval of the rezoning of R-PUD 21-2 and shall not be considered approved until the aforementioned PUD case becomes officially effective.
28. The same elevation, materials or color scheme on a home shall not be permitted on either side of a house or across the street from a house.

Motion was seconded by Mr. Meyer. Motion PASSED by a roll call vote of 2-0. (Ayers, Hight and Loftis recused)

SUBDIVISIONS

S-21-1, Dean's Plumbing

Ms. Pereira summarized the staff report dated April 2, 2021, on a request by William and Pamela Dean, 649 Monroe Drive, Xenia, OH 45385. The applicant is requesting approval of a final subdivision for 1.558 acres of land directly east of the intersection of Greer Drive and North Fairfield Road. Staff recommended approval of a case with three conditions.

Mr. Self asked if Planning Commission would see a specific site plan of the lot. Mr. Pereira explained a conditional use case was approved in 2019. Mr. Self and Ms. Pereira discussed a condition that was placed on the conditional use case regarding outdoor storage of vehicles.

Mr. Loftis MOVED to approve S-21-1 with three conditions:

1. The approved record plan shall be the plan stamped "Received FEB 04 2021".
2. 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.
3. All concerns and comments of the Planning and Zoning Department, City Engineer, Greene County Sanitary Engineer, and Greene County Auditor shall be addressed and satisfied prior to release of the record plan for recording.

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

S-21-2, Germany Lane

BEAVERCREEK PLANNING COMMISSION, 4/7/2021

Ms. Pereira summarized the staff report dated April 2, 2021, on a request by John Kopilchack, Synergy Development, 3500 Pentagon Blvd., Ste. 500, Beavercreek, OH 45431. The applicant is requesting approval of a final subdivision for 4.183 acres of land at the southwest corner of the intersection of Germany Lane and Wynkoop Court. Staff recommended approval of the case with four conditions.

Mr. Self said this would have frontage on both streets. Ms. Pereira said yes it would, but in the future Wynkoop Court may be removed.

Mr. Ayers MOVED to approve S-21-2 with four conditions:

1. The approved record plan shall be the plan stamped "Received Mar 08, 2021".
2. 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.
3. Impact fees shall be paid prior to the release of a zoning permit for the site.
4. All concerns and comments of the Planning and Zoning Department, City Engineer, Greene County Sanitary Engineer, and Greene County Auditor shall be addressed and satisfied prior to release of the record plan for recording.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Loftis MOVED adjournment at 7:48 p.m., seconded by Mr. Ayers. Motion PASSED by majority voice vote.

Melissa Gillaugh
Deputy Clerk