

**Monroe Planning Commission Minutes**  
**January 29, 2019 – 6:00 pm**  
**233 South Main Street, Monroe, Ohio**

The Planning Commission of the City of Monroe met in regular session at 6:00 pm on January 29, 2019. The meeting was held at Monroe City Hall.

**Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 6:02 pm by Mr. Morris. Members present were Steve Wood, Ron Tubbs, James Berry, and Robert Routson.

Also present were: Kameryn Jones, Planner; Deana England, Deputy Clerk of Council; and Jordan Parker, Engineering Technician.

Mr. Tubbs was sworn in by Debbie Armitage to another term.

Mr. Wood moved to elect Mr. Morris as Board Chair; seconded by Mr. Tubbs. Voice vote. Motion carried.

Mr. Wood moved to elect Mr. Berry as Board Secretary; Seconded by Mr. Tubbs. Voice vote. Motion carried.

Mr. Tubbs moved to approve the minutes from the November 29, 2018 meeting; Seconded by Mr. Berry. Voice vote. Motion carried.

Mr. Morris opened the Public Hearing at 6:04pm.

**Case No. 2019-1-3 Consideration of a zoning map amendment for parcels 11053000185, C1800009000011, C1800009000029, C1800009000030, and D7000011000001, totaling 117.361 acres, along Butler Warren Road to be rezoned from C-2 General Commercial to L-1 Light Industrial.**

Mr. Chesar presented Planning Commission with supporting document exhibits concerning case No 2019-1-3 and Case No. 2019-1-4.

Mr. Chesar stated that Lenny Robinson of Corridor 75 Park has submitted an application for zoning map amendment for five parcels located south of Mason Road and east of I-75. The total area of these parcels is 117. 361 acres according to the applicant. The request is for a change from C-2 General Commercial to L-1 Light Industrial zoning classification.

Mr. Chesar stated that the proposed amendment is consistent with the comprehensive plan in the strategies and goals section but not the future desired land use map. It should be noted the Future Land Use Map states that the proposed parcels be zoned for commercial uses. This recommendation was based on momentum from the Cincinnati Premium Outlet mall to the north. The Comprehensive Plan

also strived for a goal of 65% Commercial/Industrial land use with 35% Residential. This proposal does not deviate from that goal. In this context, the existing comprehensive plan is nearly 10 years old. With the upcoming 2020 comprehensive plan beginning this year, City goals and objectives as well as the data to support them need to and will be reevaluated.

Mr. Chesar stated that the Planning and Zoning Code states “the purpose of a text or map amendment is to make adjustments due to changed conditions, changes in public policy, recommendations of the comprehensive plan, or that are necessary to advance the health, safety, and general welfare of the City.” The amendment may be consistent with the purpose of the Code in its ability to react to changed conditions over time as well as the comprehensive plan. The City seeks development in terms of employment opportunities for its residents. However, it is uncertain given the other industrial development occurring throughout the city that rezoning for the same use is a demonstrated need as industrial land elsewhere is readily available. The proposed amendment will not affect the health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the public. The proposed amendment, should the rezoning result in a new industrial development, would certainly have some impact on the existing natural environment, as any development would. However, City development standards would ensure proper development of any new site.

Mr. Chesar states that the applicant has stated the amendment would generate development for these sites that the current zoning has prevented from occurring. Rezoning for light industrial purposes may make logical sense as a continuation of the Park North development further east and takes advantage of nearby highway access. However, it is uncertain whether it would be the most efficient properties for industrial purposes as factors relating to incentives and other issues are involved. Additionally, with the forthcoming Comprehensive Housing Study, other policy options may be realized that did not previously exist. Adjacent zoning is industrial and the proposed light industrial zoning would be compatible. Given the context that the proposal is almost 117 acres, spot zoning is not a consideration.

Mr. Chesar stated that Public Works, Police, and Fire Departments had no comments at this time. Additionally, no public comment was received concerning this case.

Mr. Chesar stated that staff recognizes the owner wishes to further private development of their land for distribution-type uses, which they have stated are what market experts have indicated as the best light industrial use for the properties

Mr. Chesar stated that additionally, this property is highly visible from Interstate 75 and is subject to a higher level of architectural, aesthetic, and site design requirements. In Staff’s professional experience, a zoning change coupled with these design regulations will result in objections by any future distribution developer as unachievable requirements. To that end, we must consider the Planning and Zoning Code states that “the purpose of a text or map amendment is to make adjustments due to changed conditions, changes in public policy, recommendations of the comprehensive plan, or that are necessary to advance the health, safety, and general welfare of the City”.

Mr. Chesar states that the Comprehensive Plan is the document that sets the policy and ultimate land use decisions for our community. City staff recognizes that economic, social, and public policy conditions

need to be reevaluated as the Comprehensive Plan is approximately 9 years old. The Comprehensive Plan update will begin this year, an approximately 12-15-month process. Staff has discussed with the applicant this planning process and the public involvement that will occur over the next year, which will take a comprehensive look at our future growth objectives and will take into consideration property owners' input. All of these perspectives will help inform any land use recommendations and eventual zoning map changes.

Mr. Chesar stated that If Planning Commission wishes to recommend a zoning change approval to City Council, Staff will still work with the property owner during the upcoming comprehensive planning process to understand the long-term potential for the property and make any comprehensive plan adjustments that are supportable accordingly.

Lenny Robinson of 6408 Lindsey Court, Franklin, Ohio spoke in regards to the history of his family doing business in Monroe for the past 61 years. The properties in question were zoned Light Industrial back in the 1940's, the property then was rezoned to Commercial in 1998 for the reasons that these properties were placed under an optional agreement to accommodate a site plan that was proposed in 1999. Since the city now recognizes that rezoning of a property should not take place for the sole reason accommodating a specific use, the property should now be rezoned back to its original zoning state. For the past 20 years two potential builders have approached to use this property, but were unable to due to the zoning requirements. The land south of Premium Outlet Mall does not lend itself well to be Commercial property due to the location of the parcels. However, interest is high for the property if it returns to Light Industrial.

Mike Grimes of 115 Old Carriage Court, Monroe, Ohio spoke in regards to his purchase of property on the corner of Butler-Warren and Nickell Road for future residential use consisting of approximately 10 acres. It is not his desire to see warehouses be built on these sites as they would be visible from his property.

**CASE NO. 2019-1-4: Consideration of a zoning map amendment for two parcels, 07014000011 and 07012000231, totaling 164.419 acres, along Greentree Road to be rezoned form B-P Business Park to L-1 Light Industrial.**

Mr. Chesar stated that David Wright with the Kleingers Group, on behalf of Berns Nursery and Garden Center, has submitted an application for a zoning map amendment for two properties located at 6337 Greentree Road and 1401 N Union Road, parcels 07014000011 and 07012000231. The two parcels total to 164.419 acres according to the applicant survey. The request is a change from B-P Business Park to L-1 Light Industrial. As part of the 2010 Comprehensive Plan and subsequent major zoning map update in the following years, the two parcels were rezoned from H-1 and L-1 industrial designations to B-P Business Park. The property owner has stated since this time, there has been little development activity with these parcels. According to the applicant, brokers and others in real estate have suggested that the current zoning is not appropriate for the property. The applicant has stated while the request is to rezone for an industrial use, the only other appropriate land use in the near term would be residential or agricultural.

Mr. Chesar stated that while the proposed amendment does not correct an error necessarily, it does reflect the demand, according to the applicant, for industrial uses for these parcels. As the applicant has stated, more commercially oriented uses permitted under the BP Business Park zoning designation have not come to fruition since the major zoning map change in 2013.

Mr. Chesar states that it should be noted the Future Land Use Map states that the proposed parcels either be zoned for commercial or office business park uses. However, this recommendation was based on a potential Greentree Road interchange that has not received forward momentum and most likely will not occur within the next 25 years. The Comprehensive Plan also strived for a goal of 65% Commercial/Industrial land use and 35% Residential. This proposal does not deviate from that goal. In this context, the existing comprehensive plan is nearly 10 years old. With the upcoming 2020 comprehensive plan beginning this year, City goals and objectives as well as the data to support them need to and will be reevaluated.

Mr. Chesar stated that the City often seeks development in terms of employment opportunities for its residents. However, it is uncertain given the other industrial development occurring throughout the city that rezoning for the same use is a demonstrated need, as there is readily available undeveloped industrial land within the city. The proposed amendment will not affect the health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the public. The proposed amendment, should the rezoning result in a new industrial development, would certainly have some impact on the existing natural environment, as any development would. However, City development standards would ensure proper development of any new site.

Mr. Chesar stated that according to the applicant, the amendment would help ensure quicker development of these parcels. However, it is uncertain whether these would be the most efficient properties for industrial purposes given highway access is limited and there are other factors such as incentives involved. Additionally, with the forthcoming Comprehensive Housing Study, other policy options may be realized that did not previously exist. Adjacent zoning is Business Park and the proposed light industrial zoning is not necessarily incompatible. Given the context that the proposal is almost 165 acres, spot zoning is not a consideration.

Mr. Chesar stated that Staff recognizes the owner's wish to further development of their land for distribution-type uses, which they have stated are what market experts have indicated as the best light industrial use for the properties. The anticipated potential of the Business Park Zoning has not resulted in any development to date. Staff presently does not dispute that another zoning classification, such as light industrial, could yield beneficial development results. However, Staff emphasizes that we must also recognize that industrial zoning existed for a number of years prior to the 2013 rezoning which only yielded minimal development. It is important to note that rezoning for specific uses is not recommended as land sales, agreements, etc. do not always materialize and a rezoning opens all options permitted in the district.

Mr. Chesar added that Staff would be remiss if it did not point out that over the past 10 years, we have had considerable experience with reviewing multiple distribution center buildings that have resulted in

millions of square feet of warehouse space. Additionally, this property is also highly visible from Interstate 75 and is subject to a higher level of architectural, aesthetic, and site design requirements. In Staff's professional experience, a zoning change coupled with these design regulations will result in objections by any future distribution developer as unachievable requirements.

Mr. Chesar stated that we must consider the Planning and Zoning Code states that "the purpose of a text or map amendment is to make adjustments due to changed conditions, changes in public policy, recommendations of the comprehensive plan, or that are necessary to advance the health, safety, and general welfare of the City". City staff recognizes that economic, social, and public policy conditions need to be reevaluated as the Comprehensive Plan is approximately 9 years old. The Comprehensive Plan update will begin this year, an approximately 12-15-month process. Staff has discussed this planning process with the applicant and the public involvement that will occur over the next year, which will take a comprehensive look at our future growth objectives and will take into consideration property owners' input. All of these perspectives will help inform any land use recommendations and any zoning designation changes.

Mr. Chesar stated that the Fire, Police, nor Public Works Departments have any comments. No public comment regarding this case has been received at this time.

Mr. Chesar stated that it is Staff's recommendation is for the applicant to work with the City to understand and build consensus towards land use goals through this comprehensive plan update as it will take into account policies for zoning, subdivisions, transportation planning, economic development, parks and open space, sustainability, housing, and public health among other objectives. All of these topics will provide insight into the highest and best use of the properties.

David Wright with Klineger's Group and Mike Berns of 825 Greentree Road, Middletown, Ohio spoke in regards to conversations with Warren County Engineers Office to confirm that the Greentree Road project is most likely not to happen in the foreseeable future. They would also like to change zoning back to its previous state prior to the proposed road project. In 1996 the garden center was built on the corner of Greentree Road to serve local residents landscaping needs. Recently, Berns Garden Center was recognized as one of the top 100 garden centers in the United States. The family has chosen now to sell the parcels presented to meet future family needs, expand the garden center, and succession planning for the 3<sup>rd</sup> generation to operate the business. They have met with realtors to sell the property and have been advised that with the present zoning, it will be a difficult/no sell.

Jeff Wieling of 1242 North Union Road, Lebanon, Ohio spoke in regards to Warren Counties Strategic Plan for Greentree Road and its stringent requirements that would be given in regards to development in that area. He would like to see that when this property is developed that it is done in a manner that takes adjacent property owners in consideration.

Nick Brooks of 6514, Greentree Road Lot A, Middletown, Ohio also spoke in regards to the Warren County Strategic Plan for that area and has concerns that if zoning is changed that code requirements will not meet expectations of that original plan. This change would allow large warehouses, rather than small business's.

Mr. Berry moved to accept the exhibits as presented; Seconded by Mr. Woods. Voice vote. Motion carried.

Mr. Berry moved to close the Public Hearing at 7:14pm; Seconded by Mr. Wood. Voice vote. Motion carried.

Mr. Berry moved to amend the agenda to discuss Public Hearing items first and move the presentation by the University of Cincinnati Economic Center regarding the Comprehensive Housing Study to the end of the meeting; Seconded by Mr. Woods. Voice vote. Motion carried.

Mr. Morris would like to put on record to recommend to Council a moratorium so that no further Heavy or Light Industrial rezoning occur until after the new Comprehensive Plan Study is complete.

Mr. Berry moved to make a recommendation to Council of approval for Case No. 2019-1-3 Consideration of a zoning map amendment for parcels 11053000185, C1800009000011, C1800009000029, C1800009000030, and D7000011000001, totaling 117.361 acres, along Butler Warren Road to be rezoned from C-2 General Commercial to L-1 Light Industrial; Seconded by Mr. Wood. Voice vote. Motion carried.

Mr. Berry moved to make a recommendation to Council of approval for CASE NO. 2019-1-4: Consideration of a zoning map amendment for two parcels, 07014000011 and 07012000231, totaling 164.419 acres, along Greentree Road to be rezoned from B-P Business Park to L-1 Light Industrial; Seconded by Mr. Wood. Voice vote. Motion carried.

**CASE NO. 2019-1-1: Consideration of a final plat for Monroe Center Commercial Subdivision.**

Ms. Jones stated that .17ac East of Senate, LLC has submitted an application for final plat for Monroe Center, approximately 17 acres of commercial property along Senate Drive and State Route 63. In February 2016, the preliminary plat was approved, which included acreage to the west of Senate Drive. During the July 2018 Planning Commission case for the retail development now known as Monroe Center (corner of proposed "Heimer Drive" and State Route 63), Planning Commission and staff noted concern about traffic attempting to cross from Premium Outlets Drive to "Heimer Drive". It should be noted that delineators are to be installed in this area along State Route 63 to further restrict access. This commercial subdivision will dedicate two new public roads, associated infrastructure, and create four new commercial lots. The specific configuration and final number of lots have not been determined at this time.

Ms. Jones stated that that the Fire Department proposes the street names are problematic for safety services considering Monroe already has a Westheimer Drive. The Police Department states that the proposed street names should be changed, as they will cause confusion for safety services. The Public Works Department remarked that delineators along State Route 63 to prevent vehicle traffic crossing over the highway to the new development will be installed.

Ms. Jones stated that Staff recommends approval of this site plan application with the following conditions: Delineators along State Route 63 are to be installed as required to prevent access north

across State Route 63 from Premium Outlets Drive to this subdivision, the applicant agrees that the names of both streets will be changed as approved by the city, and all other Staff comments are met.

Mr. Berry moved to recommend approval to Council for Case No. 2019-1-1 Consideration of a final plat for Monroe Center Commercial Subdivision with the following conditions: Delineators along State Route 63 are to be installed as required to prevent access north across State Route 63 from Premium Outlets Drive to this subdivision, the applicant agrees that the names of both streets will be changed as approved by the city, and all other Staff comments are met; Seconded by Mr. Woods. Voice vote. Motion carried.

**CASE NO. 2019-1-2: Consideration of a site plan for McDonald's restaurant.**

Ms. Jones stated that Ryan Stroup with MDM, LLC has submitted a site plan application for McDonald's restaurant. The site is approximately 3 acres, with just under 2 acres being developed with new infrastructure. The remaining acre, which previously functioned as a gravel parking lot frequented by semi trucks, will be reseeded and left as open space and is intended to assist with drainage. The applicant has indicated this is a full rebuild, with the new building to be approximately 4,900 square feet. The new site will have two drive thru lanes and the existing outdoor dining area will be removed. The applicant anticipates a start date of March and completion date of June.

Ms. Jones stated that the applicant is required 49 parking stalls based on 4,934 square feet. The applicant has proposed 60 parking stalls, 5 stalls beyond the 10% variance granted by right. The applicant has stated two mobile pickup parking stalls, two drive thru parking stalls, and two bus parking stalls have necessitated this overage.

Ms. Jones stated that code requires sidewalks along all portions of a parcel that front a public or private street as well as a sidewalk connection from the road to the use. As this site has three public frontages, a 5-foot wide sidewalk is required along State Route 63 and two sides of New Garver Road to the north and east. A future walk has been shown along all three frontages but are not proposed at this time. The public walk along the east side of the property needs to be relocated to account for a typical 5' walk and 6' tree lawn. The applicant agrees to adhere to this standard, but has indicated the eastern side may need additional consideration given the existing drainage ditch. Relocation of this walk must be included in a final set of plans for approval. Staff understands there are no plans for development on the northern portion of this property, which has been reinforced by the applicant utilizing the area to address drainage issues. Though Staff and the applicant had originally discussed installation of public sidewalks at a future date when a new development occurs, sidewalk installation and associated street trees concurrent with this rebuild is most likely warranted. Staff recommends installation of the northern and eastern public sidewalks as part of this project and permitting the southern walk required along State Route 63 be installed at a future date as determined by the City. Sidewalks fronting a customer entrance must be a minimum of 8 feet in width. It appears sidewalk proposed along the building do not meet this minimum requirement in most areas. The applicant notes the sidewalks directly in front of entrance doors are 11 feet wide and requests that other areas be permitted to remain 6 feet wide to maintain space for landscaping against the building.

MS. Jones states that street trees are required along all private and public frontages. The south side of the site is required seven trees based on 40' on center placement. Only four trees are proposed. The east side, where public frontage begins, is required seven trees; no trees are shown. The north side is required seven trees; no trees are shown. As stated in previous comments, Staff understands there may be no development long term for this part of the property and it cannot be developed given the proposed storm water detention for this project. Therefore, Staff requests that sidewalk connections and street trees be installed as part of this project as opposed to a future date. All plant types must meet City minimum size and species requirements. All canopy trees and street trees proposed must be a minimum 40' height at maturity and all screening shrubs must be 36 inches high at installation and an evergreen species. The applicant has proposed 24-inch evergreen shrubs, which does not meet the minimum size requirement. Access drives and drive thru lanes are required one tree for every 50 linear feet and three bushes for every 15 linear feet. Staff recommends waiving this requirement, which only applicable on the south side of the site, in order to accommodate the required seven street trees previously mentioned.

Ms. Jones states as a reminder, all rooftop and ground-mounted equipment must be screened from view. The proposed dumpster screening should match the principal building in material type and proportions. The dumpster screening must be one foot taller than the dumpster structure to ensure complete screening. Staff requests confirmation regarding this item.

Ms. Jones states that in regards to architectural requirements, the base-body-cap design requirement does not appear to be met. The applicant has raised the areas with brown metal material (Aluminum Batten) above the parapet line; however, there is no overall cap over the entire building. In addition, the intent of the cap is to be distinguishable from the base and body via changes in material, color, and profile, which the proposed building does not achieve. As this is a flat roof building, parapet walls should include a three-dimensional cornice treatment projecting a minimum of 8 inches perpendicularly from the building wall. Staff requests clarification on this item. Parapets that extend more than two feet above the roof must have a depth of two feet. Staff requests clarification on this item. Building facades visible from a public ROW are required to have a minimum 25% window area. This requirement is met on the south side of the building and nearly met on the east side with 23%, but not along the north or west sides of the building. The applicant has stated they are not able to increase window area on the north or east sides any further as it affects the cooler/freezer and incoming utilities. Staff would also like to emphasize that spandrel glass is limited to 20% on walls visible or facing a public right-of-way. It appears the applicant is exceeding this percentage on the north, west, and east sides of the building. A calculation is needed to understand the amount of glass compared to spandrel proposed. The applicant has stated the window requirement is not feasible on the east or north due to conflict with delivery doors, utility closets, and other equipment. Facades visible from a public street and that are 60 feet wide or wider must incorporate offsets at least two feet deep at a minimum of 20 feet long every 40 feet. It does not appear the east or west facades meet this requirement. The applicant has shown bump outs 1-foot 10 deep that extends slightly higher than the overall parapet line at the drive thru window and several other areas around the building.

Ms. Jones states that the entrance drive off New Garver to the east exceeds the 2.5 fc maximum lighting permitted.

Ms. Jones stated that the Public Works Department comments include depressed curb and gutter along the West side of Garver Road, south of the intersection will need to be removed and replaced to match existing roll curb per City of Monroe standards, adding a note to the plan set (Sheet C-1A) that the north side of the lot shall be stripped of all pavement, gravel, etc. and replaced with a minimum of 4" of topsoil, seed and straw. The north side of the lot cannot be developed in the future due to the requirements of the storm water detention.

Ms. Jones stated that the Police and Fire Departments have no comment at this time. The Public Works Department requests that the depressed curb and gutter along the West side of Garver Road, south of the intersection will need to be removed and replaced to match existing roll curb per City of Monroe standards, note to the plan set (Sheet C-1A) that the north side of the lot shall be stripped of all pavement, gravel, etc. and replaced with a minimum of 4" of topsoil, seed and straw, note that the north side of the lot cannot be developed in the future due to the requirements of the storm water detention.

Ms. Jones stated that Staff recommends approval of the case only if the applicant is willing to Code requirements. Items to be addressed are the public sidewalk and street tree installation on the three site frontages, architectural plans to address staff report comments regarding Code requirements for minimum offsets, base-body-cap elements, and limitations on spandrel glass, all plant types selected must meet minimum size and species requirements, an updated GIS compatible file be submitted to the City, and all other Staff and department comments be met, with particular attention to Public Works comments.

Mr. Berry moved to conditionally approve Case No. 2019-1-2 Consideration of a site plan for McDonald's restaurant as long as the following conditions are met: Architectural design must meet all current code requirements, the public sidewalk and street tree installation on the three site frontages, architectural plans to address staff report comments regarding Code requirements for minimum offsets, base-body-cap elements, and limitations on spandrel glass, an updated GIS compatible file be submitted to the City, all other Staff and department comments be met, with particular attention to Public Works comments, a sidewalk be installed at the lower entrance on the east side of the property, installation of sidewalk and street trees along State Route 63 and New Garver Road be installed when the city deems necessary at the property owners expense, signage review to comply with current code standard, granting of a waiver for landscape requirements on the northern side of the lot; Seconded by Mr. Wood. Voice vote. Motion carried.

Mr. Routson left the meeting at 9:00pm.

**Presentation by University of Cincinnati Economics Center of the Comprehensive Housing Study**

Mr. Chesar introduced the Comprehensive Housing Study initiative and stated that University of Cincinnati Economics Center representatives would provide detailed insight into their findings.

Mr. David Weiss with the University of Cincinnati Economics Center presented a summary of the Comprehensive Housing Study for the City of Monroe. Mr. Weiss stated that the essential question of the study was to determine what strategy should the City of Monroe pursue over the next 10-15 years to achieve housing growth that meets demand and aligns with its long-term community vision?

Mr. Weiss reviewed the potential opportunities and constraints of how much growth can be expected, what is the city's target market, what are the best practices other communities have implemented, what should be the composition of housing growth, and what are the city's vision and goals. The first step of the study was to examine physical and economic characteristics of Monroe's housing stock and socioeconomic, demographic, and employment composition of the city. Mr. Weiss then examined various comparable communities including Mason, Springboro, Trenton, Lebanon, West Chester, Hamilton, and Middletown and discussed the rationale for the comparisons. The data comparisons reviewed population growth, age analysis and household size, annual household incomes, economic vulnerability and risk assessment, and future employment opportunities with 15 and 30 minute drives. Mr. Weiss stated that many residents work elsewhere to high paying positions and commute from Monroe and Monroe residents on average spend less of their overall income on housing costs indicating a move up market. The projected job growth of high wage earners working within 30-minute commute of Monroe was discussed as a potential source for higher end residential and luxury apartments.

Mr. Weiss stated that the analysis shows Monroe's housing stock is fairly homogenous with single family homes compared to the other communities and that a possible strategy should be to diversify housing stock. Mr. Weiss indicated that few \$300,000 homes (assessed value) exist in Monroe as percentage of overall homes compared to other communities. Mr. Weiss reviewed comparisons of luxury apartments in nearby communities and discussed their high occupancy rates due to high-earning professionals and empty nesters. He stated analysis shows apartments are not necessarily linked to declines in a community's property values, median income, or occupancy rate.

Mr. Weiss presented four growth scenarios which included scenario 1 with continuation of the status quo of nearly all new is in form of single-family homes with values between \$150,000 and \$300,000; Scenario 2 with peer community growth applied to Monroe housing growth to reflect growth trends from 2013-2016 across Hamilton, Lebanon, Mason, Springboro, and West Chester; Scenario 3 which would limit all new growth to \$300,000 or higher single-family homes or scenario 4 which includes \$300,000 and higher single-family home and luxury apartment growth evenly split. Mr. Weiss detailed the projected number of new homes or apartments for each scenario with estimates of new adults and children, annual earnings tax projections, annual property tax projections, annual Police/EMS/Fire costs, annual tax revenue projections per new resident and annual Fire/EMS/Police costs per resident.

Mr. Weiss stated that housing growth has outpaced other communities but has slowed, strong economic conditions and home buying power in Monroe exists, high growth in high-wage jobs are projected around the city, and that our residents have a willingness to commute. Mr. Weiss concluded

the presentation by stating that diversification of housing stock can better meet housing demand, bring in amenities, limit school enrollment expansion, and improve city finances.

Mr. Berry asked if a scenario exists that showed a mix of 75 percent luxury apartments and 25 percent residential occurred.

Mr. Weiss stated that analysis did not occur but, could be possible to complete.

Mr. Morris stated that from 2000-2005 the City growth in combination with the school district split caused high growth within the city.

Mr. Chesar stated that options for growth could be further explored in Comprehensive Plan process.

Mr. Morris stated that University of Cincinnati Economics Center presented a good report with a lot of information and he is interested in City Council's view of the report. Mr. Morris asked if Planning Commission would like to make a recommendation.

Mr. Berry indicated that Planning Commission did not have a recommendation and that the report was comprehensive.

Mr. Tubbs moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:56pm; Seconded by Mr. Berry. Voice vote. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted by:

Deana England  
Executive Assistant/Deputy Clerk of Council