

PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
Tuesday, October 27, 2015

Mr. Paul Clark called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

ATTENDANCE

Present: Paul Clark, Amy Korenyi-Both, Jim Durham, Bill Etson, Robert Muzechuk, and Jim Briggs. Also present were City Planner Andrew Rodney, City Engineer Jim Brinegar, Staff Engineer Alisha Hammond, Planner Mark Yandrick and Assistant Clerk of Council Julie Weaver. Mr. John Palcher, Councilmember, also attended.

Absent: Kevin Von Handorf.

EXCUSE ABSENT MEMBERS

Mr. Rodney stated Mr. Von Handorf had emailed that he was out of town on business.

MOTION: Mr. Briggs made a motion to excuse the absence of Mr. Von Handorf. Ms. Korenyi-Both seconded the motion. The motion passed 6-0.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

No additions or corrections were noted for the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting of September 29, 2015.

MOTION: Mr. Briggs made a motion to approve the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting of September 29, 2015, as distributed. Mr. Muzechuk seconded the motion. The motion passed by a vote of 5-0-1, with Mr. Etson abstaining.

OPENING STATEMENT

Mr. Clark read the Opening Statement concerning protocol for public hearings.

NEW BUSINESS

Application P-2015-0046: Major Site Plan for the Cornerstone North Village Center
5200 Cornerstone North Boulevard
Applicant: Robert Hall, Cornerstone Developers, Ltd.

Mr. Rodney presented the staff report for Application P-2015-0046, the Major Site Plan for restaurants, retail businesses, parking, pedestrian amenities and landscaping in this B-PD zoning district in the Cornerstone Development, north of Costco. The plan mimicked the Final Development Plan for Phase III of Cornerstone Development, adopted by Council in July 2015. Included were proposals for grading, a cross-access easement with Costco, stormwater management, setbacks, the parking lot layout, lighting, landscaping, the pylon sign, and the color palette. The pedestrian area included a fountain, an entry feature, decorative lighting, street

furniture and planters. The Planning Department's concerns centered on the alignment of the two drives at the intersection with the Costco cross-access easement, the need for sidewalks to be consistently six feet wide, and the size and placement of the planters used with the street furniture. Mr. Rodney suggested fewer and larger planters and a slight change in the intersection angle that would only remove one parking space. Mr. Rodney asked for discussion of whether the 2' high fountain wall was high enough. Staff recommended approval of the Major Site Plan for this pedestrian area, subject to the following eight conditions:

1. A final plan for the lighting of pedestrian ways, plazas, and façades shall be subject to review and approval by the City Planner. All parking lot and pedestrian plaza lights shall be consistent with the Phase 1A outlot lighting in design, height, and light temperature.
2. Pedestrian amenities such as benches, planters, overhead lighting, and bollard lighting shall be liberally spread throughout entrance walkways and Village plaza areas. A revised Street Furniture and Lighting Plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City Planner. Each specified planter (LandscapeForms, Sorella) shall have no single dimension less than 30 inches.
3. All sidewalks within the subject area of this Major Site Plan shall be at minimum six (6) feet in width.
4. The cross-access drive connection to the Costco parking lot shall be properly aligned to avoid a skewed intersection subject to review and approval by the City Engineer and City Planner.
5. Handicap accessible parking in the north parking lot shall be relocated to the far eastern end of the lot, with a sidewalk connection, subject to review and approval by the City Planner.
6. A pedestrian connection to the entry feature plaza shall be provided to the adjacent sidewalk to the south.
7. Detailed plan review comments from the Public Works Department shall be incorporated into construction plans subject to review and approval by the City Engineer. An Ohio-licensed professional engineer is to stamp, sign, and date the plans.
8. Detailed plan review comments from other review agencies, including utilities and Sugar creek Fire Department, shall be incorporated into construction plans subject to review and approval by the City Engineer. An Ohio-licensed professional engineer is to stamp, sign, and date the plans.

Mr. Brinegar, City Engineer, said several items should be noted, if not added, to the conditions. He pointed out that staff was not in favor of a construction access from Wilmington Pike, north of the Village Center Drive, that was included in the construction phasing and set up access plan. Staff felt the north parking lot might be used for access into the village center rather than heavily travelled Wilmington Pike. Mr. Brinegar voiced concern that the north parking lot might encroach into the tree preservation area and over a storm sewer outfall into the creek; he asked for better definition of the area. For ADA access, he recommended a 6' sidewalk southward through the parking lot.

Mr. Clark opened public comment.

Mr. Robert Hall, 3475 Newmark Drive, Miamisburg, thanked staff for the recommendation for approval and discussed a variety of elements. He asked for no additional conditions related to Mr. Brinegar's comments, but promised to work closely with staff to resolve the items. He noted that the plans for the lighting and landscaping of the plaza area were incomplete and the use of string lighting was being considered. Mr. Hall asked that Conditions #2 and #4 be deleted. For Condition #2, he said the landscape architect had worked diligently on the size and placement of thirty planters amid the layout of the street furniture. The architect had carefully arranged fifteen benches, the landscaping and other pedestrian amenities. He said that the Oberer group would be happy to work with staff, but he did not want to be tied to the 30" planters listed in Condition #2. For Condition #4, he felt that the intersection within the access-easement already aligned sufficiently. Changes would eliminate needed parking spaces. If Condition #2 and Condition #4 were to remain, he asked that each Commission member give specific reasons for the decision. As to adding a condition related to construction access, he requested that no condition be included. He noted that public roads, private drives and private parking areas would be under construction at the same time, creating the need for coordination of construction equipment and material storage. He asked Planning Commission to refrain from drafting any additional conditions.

Mr. Clark closed the public comment.

Discussion followed. Mr. Etson stated he did not feel that Condition #2 should be removed in its entirety, but he did not want to require all the planters to be at least 30 inches. He was willing to leave Condition #4 because he felt the engineers should figure out the an acceptable compromise for the alignment issue. Mr. Muzechuk agreed that the rectangular planters would look boxy and would handcuff the landscape architect unnecessarily. Ms. Korenyi-Both preferred variety in the size of the planters. She felt some smaller planters were appropriate for use on sidewalks. She was in favor of striking or rewording Condition #2. Mr. Muzechuk asked if stop signs were needed for the intersection in the access easement. Mr. Brinegar said that staff had already requested stop signs, and Mr. Rodney added that the drive needed a slight adjustment. He felt significant improvement could be made with the loss of only one parking space.

MOTION: Mr. Durham made a motion to approve Application P-2015-0046, the Major Site Plan for the Village Center, subject to the 8 conditions recommended by staff, but deleting the last sentence of Condition #2, relating to planter size. Mr. Briggs seconded the motion. Prior to the vote, the group concurred to change the wording of Condition #8 to reflect "the proper fire review authority" in place of the "Sugar creek Fire Department." Planning Commission approved the motion in a 6-0 vote.

2016 Planning Commission Submittal Calendar

Mr. Rodney noted that the submittal calendar was similar to the past year, with 3½ week deadlines for submittal of all applications except development plans. Development Plans required a lead time of six weeks, because of the need for in-depth review.

MOTION: Mr. Briggs made a motion to adopt the 2016 Submittal Calendar, as distributed. Ms. Korenyi-Both seconded the motion. The motion passed 6-0.

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Rodney introduced Wright State Planning Department students who were in attendance.

Mr. Rodney confirmed which commission members would be attending the Miami Valley Planning and Zoning Workshop on Friday, December 4, 2015, before noting that webinar training was also available. He previewed a couple of possible upcoming cases and reported on the progress of a number of recent ones.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Clark noted that the next meeting of the Planning Commission would be on Tuesday, November 24, 2015 at 7:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers and adjourned the meeting shortly after 8:30 p.m.



Mr. Paul Clark

Chair of the Planning Commission