

Monroe Planning Commission Minutes
August 18, 2020 – 6:00 pm
This meeting was held electronically (remotely) pursuant to
Ohio Revised Code Section 121.221

The Planning Commission of the City of Monroe met in regular session (Zoom Meeting) at 6:00 pm on August 18, 2020. The meeting was held at Monroe City Hall (Zoom Meeting).

Call to Order

Mr. Morris called the meeting to order at 6:17 pm.

Roll Call

Members present: Dan Clark and Ron Tubbs.

Staff members present: Kevin Chesar, Director of Development; Kameryn Jones, Planner; Deana England, HR Specialist; William Brock, City Manager/City Engineer; and Nick Baxter, Community Service Specialist.

Mr. Tubbs motioned to excuse Mr. Wood and Mr. Rouston from the meeting; seconded by Mr. Clark. Voice vote. Motion carried.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Tubbs moved to approve the meeting minutes from June 16, 2020; seconded by Mr. Clark. Voice vote. Motion carried.

Business

Case No. 2020-8-6. Consideration of a site plan for Marichron Pharma LLC

Mrs. Jones stated that Gary Hart of HH Structural has submitted a site plan application to develop a Marichron Pharma LLC, a proposed medical marijuana processing facility. The site will be located on approximately 2.9 acres on Baker Drive and the building is proposed to be 8,960 square feet. The property is currently zoned L-1 Light Industrial.

Street trees are required to be placed in the tree lawn between curb and sidewalk. However, the northernmost street tree may be moved further west behind the sidewalk to alleviate traffic safety and visibility issues. Wheel stops are required on the 9 parking stalls proposed at the rear of the site as it does not appear continuous curb will be used anywhere on site. Applicant confirmation is requested. A minimum 20% of the required front yard area (minimum 6 foot depth adjacent to ROW) is landscaped. Staff requests a calculation of this figure. Buffer Type D is required along the western/rear property line as it is adjacent to residences. The applicant has proposed Option 2. The applicant must show elevations of the 6' solid fence proposed along this frontage. As a reminder, any rooftop or ground-mounted equipment installed as part of this project must be fully screened from view. Elevations of dumpster enclosure are required. Elevations of the proposed solid wood fence at the rear of the site is requested.

Parking area in the rear of the site is under-lit and must be revised to a minimum 0.3 fc, which has been addressed. Overall the applicant has met the architectural requirements for the site. In anticipation of future employee growth, a shadow parking area has been indicated and if/when desired by the applicant, all current parking, landscaping, etc. regulation will need to be met.

Mr. Chesar stated the color rendering and brick type being utilized needs to be specified to ensure compliance.

The Police Department had no comment, at this time. Fire Department stated that a Knox Box is required at the front door and the gate at the driveway access will need a padlock from Knox. The 2 yd. dumpster inside is not permitted by Section 304 of the Ohio Fire Code. Fire has the right to comment during the plans review process. Please expand upon operations of the processing facility to understand any production, quantities, types/forms of cannabis, etc. Public Works Department stated that the site plan provided: Sheet C1, does not scale. The City will need a scalable site plan submitted before any final reviews can be finalized. Detention calculations for the design of the regional basin will need to be submitted to the City, for review to review development Tc calcs and impervious area calcs compared to what is shown on this submittal for this lot. Plans must be submitted to Butler County for sanitary sewer review and approvals. A list of supplemental specifications for City Standard dwgs (including but not limited to: walk, driveway, trench details, utility / service placement etc...) will need to be attached to the site plan. General notes will need to be added, noting compliance to ODOT CMS latest revision, and City of Monroe specifications. The SWP3 plan submitted is not compliant with OEPA or City of Monroe chapter 1028 regulations. SWP3 plans - Prior to actual construction being permitted to begin. The City will need a copy of the NOI and a full developed SWP3 plan for review and approval, along with any required chapter 1028 bonds.

Mr. Clark stated that he would like the applicant to address the fire concerns. Mr. Chesar stated that in depth fire analysis will begin with the permitting process.

Mr. Morris stated that putting the rear trees on a small mound would help with the height of the buffer.

Mr. Tubbs moved to approve Case No. 2020-8-6 Consideration of site plan for Marichron Pharma LLC with the following conditions: All Public Works/Engineering comments are satisfied prior to any final approval. All Fire Department comments are satisfied. All landscaping is installed meeting minimum height (36 inches) for plants/bushes as well as minimum tree caliper of 2 inches. Confirmation/scaling of compliance with the Buffer Type D is needed as well as front yard percentages. The northernmost street tree may be moved further west behind the sidewalk to alleviate traffic safety and visibility issues. Any ground mounted equipment installed as part of this project must be fully screened per code requirements. A GIS-compatible file be submitted in the correct State Plane Coordinates; seconded by Mr. Clark. Voice Vote. Motion Carried.

Discussion Item: Monroe Crossings Development

Mr. Chesar stated that Harry Thomas of Monroe Crossings has requested a discussion regarding a concept plan for Monroe Crossings Section 5, the remaining 105.6 acres to the east of the existing subdivision. The proposal would include initially three new single family home builders – Berkey Homes, Dallis Homes, and Schmidt Builders. The concept plan proposes 183 single family lots broken down as the following: 54— 80' wide lots (approximately .28 - .36 acres), 48— 90' wide lots (approximately .33-.46 acres) and 81— 100' wide lots (approximately .36 - .5+ acres). The Planned Unit Development

Agreement (PUD) as approved by City Council in 2002 empowers Planning Commission to approve changes to/design the unplanned southeastern quadrant as an administrative review action. City Council would be involved in the in the platting of subdivision sections but not approve any PUD changes. No Public Hearings or staged approval process is required. Staff and the developer are looking for discussion/direction on a variety of issues. Next steps would include a formal agreement drafted for Planning Commission approval as well as refined plans followed by/concurrent submittals of a preliminary subdivision plat incorporating recommendations and requirements of planning authorities, and showing topography, means of drainage, roadways, grades, sanitary and water service, and other information. The applicant has indicated that the price range for homes is anticipated to be \$375,000-\$489,000.

Mr. Chesar stated that there is a connection coming off of Hankins Road from a traffic perspective to give access to the site.

Mr. Chesar stated that there will be discussion about responsibility of maintenance for the landscape boulevard that serves as an entrance.

Mr. Chesar stated that because the subdivision is regulated under a Planned Unit Development (PUD), there is some flexibility in the requirements for individual lot development. As such, the developer and potential builders would like to discuss with Planning Commission the following items (staff analysis below for each item is in italicized). A longer overview of the history and relevant PUD rationale is given later in the report as well as the PUD agreement. A list of proposed changes by the developer as well staff recommendations/reporting on other various issues is below. It should be noted that we have met with the developer and interested parties and believe that the current vision is a positive step in the right direction from previous iterations: Lot coverage - The request is to increase in maximum impervious surface area from 30% to 40%. Due to the smaller lot sizes in the original PUD, staff understands the request in the context of the larger lot sizes that may provide for larger homes as well as usable space for accessory patios, swimming pools, etc. Further discussion of the impact is requested with Planning Commission. Building materials- The Zoning Code (in newer areas) and the PUD prohibits vinyl as a material type. The request is for 0.42 mm grade vinyl on the sides and rear of the second story of two-story homes and on the cantilever gables on the front of the house where brick is impractical. Vinyl siding will need to be evaluated based on the models presented by Planning Commission. For all single story homes the current requirements would remain with front, sides, and rear would still be required to have brick, stone, cement siding, stucco etc., except for gables, bays, etc. For reference, staff research indicates types of vinyl siding thickness: Builder's Grade – .40 mm, Thin Residential Grade – .42 mm, Standard Residential Grade – .44 mm, Thick Residential Grade – .46 mm, Super Thick Grade – .50 mm, Premium Grade – .52 – .55 mm. Side yard setbacks- requesting a 5-foot minimum side yard setback with 20 feet distance between structures for 90- and 100-foot lots. The applicant has provided plot plan examples regarding side yard setbacks (attached). Current Planning and Zoning Code requires 10 foot side yard setbacks while Monroe Crossings has been permitted 7.5 yard setbacks in the deviated section (generally the neighborhoods north/east of Roden Park Drive). If Planning Commission wishes to proceed, we would recommend that no HVAC units, concrete walkways not exceeding 3.5' or other accessory items be permitted in 5 foot side yards except for fencing. While the applicant will discuss, our understanding is that the smaller setback will allow for more options for side-loaded garages and larger

homes. Street trees- requesting waiver of street trees every 40 feet on center in the tree lawn and instead provide two (2) 1" caliper trees in the front yard of each home. The current minimum caliper required is 2 inches for street trees. Two trees per front yard could be acceptable as it is generally equivalent to covering 80 foot of frontage as current code requires street trees every 40 feet. We do not support the reduction in diameter at breast height (DBH) to one inch due to the long term viability and landscaping impact. Furthermore, discussion of the appropriate location of the trees is necessary as code would require in the tree lawn. It should be noted that a waiver of street trees was granted in the original pods based on enhanced landscaping in other areas and a payment in lieu of street tress was received. Staff research appears to only show the waiver/payment as applicable to the initial planned pods and as such current discussion regarding requirements is necessary. Open Space/Trails- The applicant has indicated compliance with the 20% open space set aside requirement. Additional confirmation that all areas meet the minimum size of 10,000 sq. ft. will be needed. A 6-foot wide trail in portions of the open space areas (as a part of the formal open space requirement) has been provided along with the intent to provide recreation opportunities with a recreation pond. The applicants follow up information has stated: The neighborhood park, the walking path and the areas adjoining such will be improved and regularly maintained for use by all residents. Residents would be able to enjoy a picnic lunch in the lawn area or fish in the water quality pond. For these reasons, we contend that the approximate 3.35 acres containing the walking trail, neighborhood park and water quality pond meet the definition of formal open space. The code requires 5% of the required open space to be formal open space. As defined by the code: Open Space, Formal open space is a generally planned and structured area that includes formally designed landscape plantings, activity areas, or is otherwise usable by the residents or occupants of the applicable development. The space is regularly maintained and may include streetscape furnishings (e.g., benches, lighting, and sculptures), recreational improvements (e.g., playground, swimming pool, tennis courts), and street improvements. Additionally, Section 1213.03 (A)(3) states that: (3) When formal open space is required, such space shall be areas of open space that have been improved for active use by residents or members of the public that may include, but is not limited to, in-ground swimming pools, playgrounds, tennis courts, jogging trails, or similar outdoor recreational uses. The overall acreage of the proposed area is 105.6 acres which results in a required 5.28 acres of formal open space while only approximately 3.35 acres are proposed. The City has heard from our residents for a number of years regarding the importance of active open space areas with community input during our 2018 Parks Master Plan and our current Comprehensive Plan Update further seeing citizens requesting more recreational opportunities. The applicant has proposed a paved walking area leading to the proposed pond at the city's request. While topography appears to be an issue to loop the trail around the pond, further discussion of the engineering issues is requested. Staff recommends widening of the trail to minimum of 8 feet but, would prefer 10 feet to allow for multi-use of pedestrians, joggers, and bicyclist to have adequate room for safety. The current trail along Hankins Road is 8 feet wide and we would further recommend a connection through the southern open space to Hankins Road which could then connect to the eastern lots (via Hankins) in some fashion. A future community park is also recommended to meet the minimum requirement.

Mr. Morris stated that side by side lots containing houses with mirror flipped side-loaded garages would position the houses too close to each other. Mr. Clark was in agreement with Mr. Morris.

Mr. Chesar stated that the PUD left the southeast quadrant as undefined regarding an approved lot plan but, did indicate that the area was intended for 80', 90', and 100' frontage lots. The staff report at that time stated "In particular, Staff recognizes that the R-3 PUD portion of the plat which is situated in the SE quadrant of the parcel will be prime for 90' and 100' wide lots which should provide for upscale houses..." The applicant has created mixing the 80', 90', and 100' lot sizes with the attached concept and in the amount of 54— 80' wide lots (approximately .28 [12,000 sq. ft.] - .36 acres [15,600 sq.ft.]), 48— 90' wide lots (approximately .33-[14,300 sq. ft.] .46 acres [20,000]) and 81— 100' wide lots (approximately .36 [15,600 sq. ft.] - .5+ [21,700 sq. ft.] acres). Roof Pitch - All dwellings shall be constructed using a minimum 5/12 pitched roof design including the roof area located over the garage. The roof area located over the porch and entrance portions of the dwelling may be constructed using a minimum 4/12 pitch roof design. Discussion with the applicant's applicability based on the proposed model types is requested. Basement vs. Slab - All potential below grade living areas shall be constructed with poured concrete walls with no more than two (2%) of the total number of single family dwellings may be built on slab foundations. Further discussion may be needed to confirm the intent with the applicant. Garage Doors - Overhead garage doors with raised panel. Further discussion may be needed to confirm the intent with the applicant. Minimum Height - No dwelling shall exceed 35 feet in height. Further discussion may be needed to confirm the intent with the applicant. Minimum floor Area (non-deviated area – south of Roden Park Drive): One and a half and two story dwellings – 1,750 square feet of livable floor area. One-story "ranch" style dwellings – 1,500 square feet of livable floor area. The PUD currently covers the southeastern quadrant by right regarding minimum size. Many of the recent new homes have exceeded these sizes and current R-2 regulations. Current base code R-2 Regulations require a minimum of 1,800 square feet regardless of one vs. two story homes. If necessary further discussion can occur. Sidewalk Requirement along Hankins Road - subdivision requirements require that at minimum a 5 foot concrete walk be constructed along Hankins Road. Further discussion with Planning Commission is requested as staff would like to discuss the possibility of an 8 foot (minimum) asphalt path constructed in lieu of the sidewalk similar to the Windsor Estates which could provide a recreational loop as well as a possible connection to the east (that may be impact the current industrial zone based on the outcome of the comprehensive plan update). An additional connection north to through open space can be discussed. Exposed Basement/Foundation - the recent construction of homes in on varying slopes has resulted in exposed concrete foundations and walkout basements that are not regulated via the PUD. Initial discussions with the developer/builders have indicated a willingness to require no exposed concrete beyond 3 feet of grade. The intent will be to have stone, brick, etc. wrapped/added in this instances. Boulevard Maintenance - it should be noted that maintenance of the landscaped boulevard indicated on Street H would not be the responsibility of City. Cluster Mailbox Locations - due to USPS requirements regarding cluster mailboxes, discussion regarding location, architectural requirements, and the ability to have a pull off as well as safe pedestrian area is necessary.

Mr. Morris stated that flat panel garage doors are not permitted.

Mr. Morris requested that the home builders make a collective effort to eliminate a ten foot gap between houses. Mr. Clark was in agreement with this request.

Mr. Morris stated that a walking trail all the way around the pond would be a good addition to the open space.

Mr. Morris stated that the minimum floor area should be increased. Mr. Morris agreed on 1,600 minimum sf for a ranch style home and 2,000 minimum sf for a two story home.

Mr. Morris stated that he is comfortable with no sidewalk being put in along Hankins Road for safety reasons.

Mr. Morris stated that he would like to see other options for the cluster mailboxes in the neighborhood to maximize safety and ease of use for the mailboxes. Mr. Tubbs recommended installing a parking area to the side of the cluster mailboxes to park a vehicle. Mr. Clark was in agreement with Mr. Morris and Mr. Tubbs. Mr. Brock stated that the USPS will have input about any changes to the cluster mailboxes.

Mr. Clark stated that he would like to see options for a thicker type of vinyl to be used on the houses or alternative building materials. Mr. Clark requested samples of the vinyl and examples of where it was previously used. Mr. Tubbs was in agreement with Mr. Clark. Mr. Morris stated that he would not like hardy plank to be used on the houses.

Mr. Clark inquired about the amount of experience that staff has with the home builders. Mr. Chesar stated that he doesn't believe the city has dealt with Schmidt Builders before. Mr. Chesar stated that Berkey Homes and Dallis Homes have built in the city before. Mr. Chesar stated that he is not aware of any issues with the homebuilders but he can look into it.

Mr. Clark requested at least an eight feet width for the walking path. Mr. Morris was in agreement with Mr. Clark.

Mr. Chesar stated that he would like to have a draft agreement and potential preliminary plat ready by the next planning commission meeting for PUD amendments. Mr. Clark and Mr. Morris were in agreement with Mr. Chesar.

Adjournment

Mr. Tubbs moved to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Mr. Clark. Voice vote. Motion carried. The planning commission meeting adjourned at 8:09 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

Nick Baxter
Community Service Specialist