

LIBERTY TOWNSHIP ZONING COMMISSION
August 19, 2019
6:00 PM
MEETING MINUTES

The Zoning Commission was called to order at 5962 Hamilton Mason Road at 6:05 P.M. by Chairman Forrest Holger. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited by those in attendance.

Upon call of the roll, members in attendance were Forrest Holger, Mike Dunn, Michael Stater and Wayne Bradshaw. Staff members Karla Chaney (Zoning Specialist) and Mark Elma (Senior Planner) were also in attendance.

Mr. Holger reviewed the procedures of the hearing and performed a group swearing in.

Mr. Holger called for case **ZC19-015: Redwood Liberty Twp 747 LLC Zone Change**

Mr. Elma presented the staff report, PowerPoint presentation and case materials.

Mr. Holger asked to hear from the applicant.

Greg Thurman *Division Manager Redwood 20 Village Square Cincinnati Ohio 45246*: Mr. Thurman stated we have a good plan here depending on what side of the aisle you are sitting on. He continued stating they have talked with Residence, the Township and County Staff and feels it is the best plan in the interest of the Township and the residence that will live here. Mr. Thurman feel they have taken into consideration the previous application, and staff recommendation, he stated this plan is the culmination of months and months of work and meeting with staff. He feels the Butler County Thoroughfare Plan is being pushed from the County down, does not feel the residence are in favor of it. Feels the Proposed North South route is a viable alternative to the BC Thoroughfare Plan.

Mr. Thurman stated mid-block is not the appropriate place for commercial mixed uses. He stated the neighbors he talked to would not like to see a use that has commercial trucking or commercial use and the dangers that would bring. The Beauty of Redwood is they build private streets that would not affect township resources. The county does not have to accept them or worry about traffic on them. Mr. Thurman stated the commercial entity shown in the plan is a viable commercial use. Mr. Thurman feel the *commercial mixed use* designation on the Comprehensive plan is antiquated; sighting Liberty Way, a couple miles to the east as the best Commercial Mixed Use area he has ever seem. Route 4 is also the appropriate area for Commercial Mixed-Use designation. Mr. Thurman does not believe their parcel is the appropriate designation for Commercial Mixed-Use and this is why he is bringing forward this plan.

Todd Folly *Pod Design Land planning and Landscape Architect consultant for Redwood 100 Northwood Blvd. Columbus Ohio*: Mr. Folly gave the Redwood presentation explaining who Redwood is what they do. Mr. Folly stated they started this process with the Township well over a year ago. They saw it as an opportunity to bring an alternative housing opportunity to Liberty serving empty nesters and young professional with their housing product. Mr. Folly stated he meet with the Township Planning Department and has been before the Butler County Planning Commission, Mr. Folly continued by stating Greg has had several different types of conversations, emails and small group meetings with a variety of people. They feel they have done their best to gather all the information out there.

Three elements that have interested in this project include the community, the township and the county. The spot where they overlap in the middle is where they want to be, with a solution that all three can be

happy. Mr. Folly stated there seem to be numerous concerns about the project but the overriding concerns they see are

- The County's concern with the Thoroughfare Plan and having an opportunity for roads to connect.
- The Townships concern with having this Mixed Use designation and what it means moving forward
- In addition, the surrounding neighbors concern of traffic impact as well as concern of having multi-family units in their neighborhood.

Mr. Folly addressed each issues

- Mr. Folly stated that the County's Thoroughfare plan indicates a neighborhood collector street to the south of their Project, although it is a conceptual location on the Butler County map. Mr. Folly felt the original intent was to have the road to the south of his development.
- Mr. Folly stated he spent a lot of time reviewing the Comprehensive Plan and one of the key areas is the expansion of housing choices. Mr. Folly explained Redwood creates a housing type that is geared toward empty nesters and young professionals. Mr. Folly stated this is a housing stock that is not accounted for in the communities they are a part of. The mixed-use corridor designation does include residential. Mr. Folly recognizes they are not providing a traditional commercial use but feel the organization and potential for their residential piece to complement residential to the south or future commercial to the north is good, and is a better transitional use to the neighbors to the east and west.
- Mr. Folly continued explaining redwood only builds single story multi-family units. Residence must go through background checks. Mr. Folly presented the interior of the apartment units. Mr. Folly stated they have been at this for quite a while, and have examined previous applications to see why they were not successful. They feel they have addressed all the issues from past proposals.

Mr. Folly explained that by using variation of a color vinyl material on the building it would create architectural character. Their intent is to use the upgraded architecture, carriage style doors on the garages and showed an optional sunroom for units on the end. Mr. Folly explained the interiors of the units, and stated rents would be \$1,500-\$1,900 per month and the development would represent approximately 31 million in tax benefits, continued by stating the development was low density. Mr. Folly highlighted the main private drives are intended to provide public access through them but are maintained as private streets if there is a way to do that. Stating that a public road presents challenges to the layout of the site due to width and setback requirements of a public street.

Mr. Folly highlighted the open space area and stated that they may be able to accommodate some pedestrian trails, and have interested in connecting to the existing walking trail system in the surrounding neighborhoods.

Mr. Holger asked for clarification of the three areas of the plan as presented. Mr. Folly explained area A would be 55 and older; Areas B would provide market rate units to attract young professionals. Mr. Holger followed up by stating he did not see any mention of amenities that that he feel would attract young professionals.

Mr. Folly explained Redwood does not provide Clubhouse, pools, things that would promote active lifestyles. Mr. Folly explained when they say young professionals they mean maybe newly married people who have not had a family or doctors, nurses who desire an opportunity to pull into their garages, close the door and not have people above or below them. Mr. Folly explained the lack of amenities is very purposeful and not the desire they look to achieve.

Mr. Holger asked if item one the Traffic Impact study has been completed. Mr. Folly stated it was under way but has not been completed. Mr. Folly stated they fully intend to work with staff on the issues at the final PUD stage. He did not have and definitive answer in regards to the Traffic Impact Study. Recognizes it is something they need.

Mr. Holger continued, commenting about the standard and upgraded architecture. He expressed his concern about how the Redwood architecture stands up to the some of the existing Multi-family complexes in Liberty Township that are designed with amenities to attract the young professionals. He does not feel the vinyl project meets Liberty Township standards. Mr. Folly stated they fully intended to get feedback from commission then have a final crack at getting the design correct. As a whole Redwood owns and maintains all their properties so there is an ongoing investment in maintaining the property. Stating with them being single story there isn't room for a lot of architectural detail before getting to the ceiling. Mr. Folly continues showing images of complete buildings.

Mr. Dunn asked if the upgraded architecture standard meets the Liberty Township standards. Mr. Folly stated they have not done those calculations yet and expect to have it complete by the final PUD.

Mr. Holger asked if the applicant was in agreement with all 16 items in the staff report. Mr. Thurman responded by going back to Mr. Dunn's comments and stated he they intend to meet the architectural guidelines and would meet Liberty Township standards if the vinyl was replaced with hardy plank siding. Mr. Dunn stated but it is not. Mr. Thurman stated they intend to meet the guidelines.

Mr. Dunn discussed his concern about density with the undefined Area C. Mr. Thurman stated density is still less an allowed in the MU-PUD district. And feels that was converted a year ago.

Mr. Dunn discussed the private roads and how the board has had trouble approving private roads because they are typically not built to the Butler County standards and are under the control of the property owner and subject to being closed by the owners.

Mr. Thurman states the thoroughfare plan shows the road clearly to the south of their property because of the safety issue with the dip in 747 to the south of the plan due to safety. Mr. Thurman thinks the Butler County Thoroughfare plan is wrong and the neighborhood collector belongs on north of their property. Discussion continued about the importance of the east west connection. In addition, the alternatives to the Thoroughfare plan the applicant is proposing.

Mr. Folly stated they interpreted the staff report comments as things they need to look at and address if they move forward. Mr. Folly stated they did have issue with staff comment #10 and wanted to see the east west street remain private. Siting the increased setbacks would create a challenge to providing the appropriate buffers.

Mr. Holger expressed his concerns that Butler County had not been satisfied, with the Traffic Impact study as well as the large list of the conditions listed in the staff report. Mr. Thurman stated they were ready to comply with all requirements in the staff report and feel they could all be fixed easily. Mr. Holger asked again about item #10,

Mr. Thurman stated that is the one condition they are not in agreement with and would not be able to comply but would address the issue with the final PUD plan. Discussion about the street design continued it was mentioned the streets do not have any curbs. Mr. Folly states that is to comply with FHA and ADA regulations.

Mr. Bradshaw asked where the mailboxes would be located.

Mr. Thurman described the location and how they would work with the street design.

Mr. Thurman described the street design as 22” of poured concrete with a painted 4’ section on each side of the road to indicate sidewalks.

Mr. Bradshaw asked several questions

- What the average length of lease in your other units across Ohio?
 - Mr. Thurman indicated 2.5 years almost double the national average length.
- Has Redwood ever had a registered complaint lodged with the Ohio general under the Fair Housing act?
 - Mr. Thurman stated probably

Discussion continued about the development and the area C.

Mr. Holger asked if there was anyone to speak as a proponent of this case. No one spoke.

Mr. Holger asked if there was anyone to speak as an opponent of this case:

- *Jeff Ducarte 4726 Farrow Court: does not want MF homes right next to their homes. They cannot find one other example of their developments so close to residential neighborhoods. Expressed concerns about reduction in property values. Feel this proposal is the 3rd worst of all the previous proposed development doesn't see how it's in line with LT comprehensive plan. Will the nursing facility be a drain on our services? Wants to see single family homes being built.*
- *Frank Mize 5394 Oak Creek Trail: concerned about the north route of the road, and already overflowing detention basins. Asked if a water study has been completed. Mr. Mize, stated he was the head of the HOA for 5 years and have not heard a word from the applicant.*
- *Unknown name - 4780 Winter park drive Vista Verde concerns of the increased traffic would affect the safety of kids playing on the existing roads in Vista Verde. Suggest the board recommend denial.*
- *Timothy Bell - 4915 Kyles Station Road: concerned about the drainage and what kind of impact this development will have on the existing condition. Doesn't like the lake of trails and doesn't want the redwood residence to use their existing trails.*
- *Rod Pork - 4870 Yellow springs (Vista Verde): Does not see how this can be approved until there is a clear plan. No other subdivision is allowed no curb gutter or sidewalk and hopes it is not allowed here. Expressed concerns about the private streets and the deterioration of those streets over time. Stated there are a lot of poor review on the internet for all the other Redwood properties.*
- *Kyle Fox - winter park drive: concerns about children's safety*
- *Kyle Bully - Sebring Court: Feel the plan presented tonight is incomplete and cannot be accepted*
- *Don Butz - 4726 Santabell Lane (Harbor Town) feel it's an incomplete application. Feels the street going out to 747 are too narrow. Doesn't not feel the development is compatible with existing homes in the surrounding neighborhoods. Does not feel rental is a good use, and brings problems. Concerned the rentals could turn into a section 8 development.*
- *Sarah Schimida - 5265 Colorado river trail: wants to preserve the community feel. As former young professionals who used to rent before buying their house they wanted the rental amenities. Concerned about the type of resident Redwood attracts "shut-ins" who don't want to go out.*
- *Steve - 5494 Oakview (Harbortown Park): moved from mason in 2014 for the brick and stone in Liberty township. Concerned the proposed property is not adding value to the existing community. And they already have a speeding issue.*

- *Barbra Bower - 5307 Sugar Maple Run (Falling Water neighborhood): in support of everything the residence have said. Concerned about the possibility of 3 stories building in area C, also concerned about selling section C. Does not want their residence using the paths Falling Waters residence pay to maintain. Concerned about School impact with 170 units, does not believe young professionals would be attracted to this type of development.*
- *Tim Easterlane – 5962 Vista Verde Ln: Recently moved from Springdale. Intentionally moved to Liberty Township because of the ruralness of the area, and the single-family homes. Wants a peaceful neighborhood where the kids can play in the streets. Concerned about the traffic, overpopulation of schools taking away from current academic standards.*
- *Paul Sandwals - 5432 Creekside Meadows: Realtor and VP of their neighborhood HOA, Stated his clients don't want to buy next to rental apartments, stated rentals do negatively impact housing values of single-family residence. Concerns about water run off issues, does not feel its fair for the apartment residence to use the walking paths their HOA pays for. Feels marketing to "young professionals" exclusively is against fair housing laws.*
- *Chuck Sizmire - 4762 Ospre Point (forth house from the proposed intersection): Appreciates the Townships efforts to protect their housing values. Concerned about the traffic impact of the 170 units and possible cut through traffic on his street. Will there be traffic lights on 747.*
- *Suzann Bruce – 4985 Snow Valley ln. (lives in the neighborhood to the north of the proposed development. Decided to move to Liberty because of the Single family homes and to get away from multi-family homes. Stated typical lease for an apartment is 2 years, were all the single family homes are 30 year mortgages the SF homes owners are vested and the apartment dwellers are not. Concerned about the loss of the strong sense of tight nit community where everyone know everyone else. Would rather see high value commercial rather than multi-family and how multi-family typically do not hold their value.*
- *Darcie Bran - 5119 Aspin Wood Drive (Aspin Trails Neighborhood) 747 and Aspin woods already has zoning for a nursing facility and doesn't feel 2 can be supported. Concerned about the drain on emergency services. Concerned about the impact the potential student population would have on the surrounding schools.*
- *Hellen Shew - 4839 Willow Springs Drive (Vista Verde Neighborhood) – Lived near Union Center before Ikea was built. Moved due to the increased traffic as Union center built up, and got a lot of cut through traffic in her neighborhood. Built a home in Vista Verde because of the rural nature.*
- *Lesley - 5708 Princeton Glendale Road; Wants a metro park, with shelter houses rather than multi-family.*
- *Bonnie Greko – Creekside Meadows neighborhood; Does not want this approved in their back yard.*

Mr. Holger asked if there was anyone to speak as a neutral party of this of this case.

1. Todd Hall 5892 Princeton Glendale Road – mentioned the land use plan as out this area as transitional. Is in favor of an upscale apartment development.

Mr. Stater made a motion to **CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING**. Mr. Dunn seconded. Upon the call of the roll, the motion passed. **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**.

Mr. Holger began the discussion stating his censors about the unaddressed comments from Liberty Township and Butler County Staff as listed in the staff report. Not having a traffic impact study completed for the development and also what is the impact of not providing the proposed Neighborhood Collector as indicated in the Butler County Thoroughfare plan.

Mr. Dunn stated his concern about having two private drives in the development. In addition, concerned about the impact of having neighborhood collector and what impact it will have on Harbor Town neighborhood. Stated the unknown about area C being the front of the development. Mr. Dunn did not like the idea of not having sidewalks on the street, especially given it's a smaller than standard street width. Mr. Dunn stated this is a needed type product but this may not be the best place for a rental community.

Mr. Holger shared his concerns about the lack of sidewalks. Does not feel this type of development would over load the school.

Mr. Holger stated his concerns about the unaddressed list of items in the staff report from Liberty Township and Butler County staff as noted in the staff report.

Mr. Dunn stated he thinks a similar type product is being built with Fieldstone Farms, and MF on Hamilton Mason. Feels the developer is asking for a lot of exceptions, and there are a lot of unknowns. He would like to see the developer meet the community standards. Mr. Dunn does not feel this meets the commercial use as outline in the Vision Plan. Mr. Dunn is also conserved about the lack of a Traffic Impact Study that Butler County would be able to review.

Mr. Stater stated his concern about the number of unresolved issues with this development and hesitates to move forward with all these unknowns. Mr. Stater's biggest issues are the unknown elements of the developments and impact to the surrounding neighborhoods; Area C the senior living facility is an unknown with potential huge implications to the development costs; lack of amenity; curb appeal and lack of curb, gutter and sidewalks on the street; no traffic impact study; and finally the inconsistency of setbacks with the surrounding neighborhoods.

Mr. Thurman stated that most of the issues addressed at the meeting were "rubber stamp" items they could easily take care of. Mr. Thurman feels with more time he can have answers to all the items brought up at the meeting. Mr. Thurman requested a 30 day extension to come back with a plan that addresses the issues of the neighbors and feel the Butler County Thoroughfare Plan is flawed for this parcel. Mr. Thurman stated he has a new plan already laid out that greatly softens the impact of the development.

Mr. Holger stated he feels the applicant has had sufficient time to clean up the issues, the case had already been tabled the month before.

Mr. Thurman stated he was willing to take this plan off the table and bring a new plan to address all the comment brought up at the meeting.

Mr. Holger stated the applicant has had the staff report of over 60 days and hasn't show any progress to addressing the items in the staff report.

Mr. Bradshaw stated he does not feel the property is appropriate for a rental product. Mr. Bradshaw feels the design will not attract young professionals especially without any amenities.

Chris Wunnenburg Director of development Schumacher Dugan. Mr. Wunnenburg stated they purchased the property with the land use plan in place. Mr. Wunnenburg stated they have brought 2 previous proposals to the board and all have been turned down. Mr. Wunnenburg stated if the board is not going to approve rental he will not bring rental proposals. However the land use plan does call for transitional residential and commercial, and transitional residential is multi-family and commercial. Mr. Wunnenburg does not feel he can develop the land given the current zoning restrictions. Mr. Wunnenburg also stated his concern about needing to add a neighborhood collector through the site. Mr. Wunnenburg feels the

items brought up in the staff report isn't appropriate for the zone change and should be resolved at the final PUD stage.

Mr. Holger denied the applicants request for an extension, the board does not feel the applicant has shown any effort to resolve any of the issues brought up by staff over the past 60 days. Mr. Holger also stated he wasn't sure apartments are the right use on this property.

Mr. Thurman stated he signed a contract 3 months ago and has not had time to put together a comprehensive plan.

Mr. Holger asked for a motion on this case.

Mr. Bradshaw made a motion to make a recommendation of **denial** for Case ZC19-023 as presented by staff. Mr. Dunn seconded. Upon call of the roll: Mr. Stater – yes; Mr. Brandshaw – yes; Mr. Dunn – yes; Mr. Holger – yes; the motion passed.

The Board took a 5 min recess:

Mr. Holger called for case **ZC19-016: Zone Change – Clawson Subdivision 5852 – 5890 Princeton Glendale Road.**

Mr. Elma presented the staff report, PowerPoint presentation and case materials.

Mr. Holger Asked to hear from the applicant.

Roger Mersch - 8461 Hayden Court Cincinnati, Has owned the property for 3 years, just recently started renting the property as a single-family residential. Was not aware it was a split zone until the property to the north changed its zoning. Mr. Mersch stated he does not have a development plan at this time.

Mr. Holger asked if there were any further questions of the applicant.

Mr. Holger asked if there was anyone to speak as a proponent of this case.

Todd Hall 7791 Joan Drive West Chester Ohio. Mr. Hall owner of the property to the north stated he was in favor of the zone change.

Mr. Holger asked if there was anyone to speak as an opponent of this case. No one spoke

Mr. Holger asked if there was anyone to speak as a neutral party of this of this case. No one spoke

Mr. Holger asked if there was a motion to close the public hearing.

Mr. Dunn made a motion to **CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.** Mr. Holger seconded. Upon the call of the roll, the motion passed. **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED.**

Mr. Holger stated this was a straightforward case given the recent zone change to the north and the other board members agreed.

Mr. Holger asked for a motion on this case.

Mr. Dunn made a motion to recommend **approval** of Case ZC19-016 as presented by staff, Mr. Stater seconded. Upon call of the roll: Mr. Holger – yes; Mr. Dunn – yes; Mr. Stater – Yes; Mr. Bradshaw –Yes; Motion approved 4-0

Mr. Holger called for case **ZC19-017: Minor Modification to the Four Bridges Final PUD – 8277 Poppy Lane.**

Mr. Elma presented the staff report, PowerPoint presentation and case materials.

Mr. Holger Asked to hear from the applicant.

Jeff England – 8277 Poppy Lane stated he was requesting the variance so he could build a house that would be in line with other houses in the neighborhoods. Mr. England explained that due to the knuckle in the road and existing setbacks the house would be much smaller than the adjacent lots.

Mr. Holger asked if there were any further questions of the applicant.

Mr. Holger asked if there was anyone to speak as a proponent of this case. No one spoke

Mr. Holger asked if there was anyone to speak as an opponent of this case. No one spoke

Mr. Holger asked if there was anyone to speak as a neutral party of this of this case. No one spoke

Mr. Holger asked if there was a motion to close the public hearing.

Mr. Dunn made a motion to **CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.** Mr. Holger seconded. Upon the call of the roll, the motion passed. **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED.**

Mr. Holger began the discussion stating the request seemed reasonable given the applicant’s presentation.

Mr. Bradshaw asked if the proposed house was larger than the existing homes to the east and west. The applicant stated they were similar in size.

A brief discussion followed insuring the sight lines and scale were appropriate to the neighborhood. The board felt it was.

Mr. Holger asked for a motion on this case.

Mr. Stater made a motion to **approve** of Case ZC19-017 as presented by staff, Mr. Bradshaw seconded. Upon call of the roll: Mr. Holger – yes; Mr. Dunn – yes; Mr. Stater – Yes; Mr. Bradshaw –Yes; Motion approved 4-0

Mr. Holger called for case **ZC19-018: Atlantic Sign Company is requesting a variance from the required Overlay District ground sign regulations on behalf of Butler County JVSD**

Mr. Elma presented the staff report, PowerPoint presentation and case materials.

Mr. Holger Asked to hear from the applicant.

Tommy Reed – Atlantic Sign Company spoke about the statewide rebranding of Butler County JVSD. Mr. Reed reviewed the signs that have already been installed on the campus and discussed how important the rebranding was to the success of the school.

Mr. Holger asked if there were any further questions of the applicant.

Mr. Dunn asked about the size of the existing sign. It seemed larger than allowed in the PGBD-O. Mr. Elma explained the sign was put in place prior to the overlay districts regulations were adopted.

Mr. Stater asked the applicant about lighting on the sign. The applicant indicated the sign would use the ground lights from the existing sign, and no new illumination would be added.

Mr. Holger asked if there was anyone to speak as a proponent of this case. No one spoke

Mr. Holger asked if there was anyone to speak as an opponent of this case. No one spoke

Mr. Holger asked if there was anyone to speak as a neutral party of this of this case. No one spoke

Mr. Holger asked if there was a motion to close the public hearing.

Mr. Dunn made a motion to **CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING**. Mr. Stater seconded. Upon the call of the roll, the motion passed. **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**.

Mr. Holger began the discussion stating the new branding was attractive, and reminded the bard the proposed sign is smaller in scale than the current non-conforming sign.

A brief discussion followed that included comment about how attractive the new branding signs are. In addition, how the consistency of signage will improve the overall look of the Liberty Township Campus.

Mr. Holger asked for a motion on this case.

Mr. Bradshaw made a motion to **approve** of Case ZC19-018 as presented by staff, Mr. Bradshaw seconded. Upon call of the roll: Mr. Holger – yes; Mr. Dunn – yes; Mr. Stater – Yes; Mr. Bradshaw –Yes; Motion approved 4-0

Mr. Holger called for case **ZC19-019: Nathan Hatter & Deborah Gibson Hatter are requesting a Minor Modification to the Four Bridges Final PUD - 6873 Oleander Court**

Mr. Elma presented the staff report, PowerPoint presentation and case materials.

Mr. Holger Asked to hear from the applicant.

Nathan Hatter – 6873 Oleander Court reviewed his plans to build a cover patio and open patio on the rear of his house. Mr. Hatter explained the bugs made it very difficult to enjoy the existing patio.

Mr. Holger asked if there were any further questions of the applicant.

Mr. Dunn asked what materials would be used in the construction of the covered patio. Mr. Hatter explained they plan on using Hardy Board and similar materials to the existing house.

Mr. Holger asked if there was anyone to speak as a proponent of this case.

Mr. Hall – spoke in favor of the proposal and stated he knows the applicant personally and spoke to his great workmanship on other projects.

Mr. Holger asked if there was anyone to speak as an opponent of this case. No one spoke

Mr. Holger asked if there was anyone to speak as a neutral party of this of this case. No one spoke

Mr. Holger asked if there was a motion to close the public hearing.

Mr. Dunn made a motion to **CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING**. Mr. Stater seconded. Upon the call of the roll, the motion passed. **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**.

Mr. Holger asked if there was any further discussion from the board. A brief discussion was had about the different variances that were allowed in this neighborhood over the years. The board felt this request was reasonable and in line with the others.

Mr. Holger asked for a motion on this case.

Mr. Dunn made a motion to **approve** of Case ZC19-019 as presented by staff, Mr. Stater seconded. Upon call of the roll: Mr. Holger – yes; Mr. Dunn – yes; Mr. Stater – Yes; Mr. Bradshaw –Yes; Motion approved 4-0

Mr. Holger called for case **ZC19-020: Fieldstone Farms Development LLC. is requesting a Minor Modification to the approved Fieldstone Farms PUD Plan**

Mr. Elma presented the staff report, PowerPoint presentation and case materials.

Mr. Holger Asked to hear from the applicant.

Terri Corner with Bayer Becker presented the Final PUD and explained the differences between the preliminary and Final PUD. Terry continued explaining the PUD is being modified to avoid disturbing two regulated waterways along the northern border of the site. Ms. Corner explained the plan does not change the number of single-family homes proposed in the preliminary PUD.

Mr. Holger asked if there were any further questions of the applicant.

Mr. Holger asked if there was anyone to speak as a proponent of this case. No one spoke

Mr. Holger asked if there was anyone to speak as an opponent of this case. No one spoke

Mr. Holger asked if there was anyone to speak as a neutral party of this of this case. No one spoke

Mr. Holger asked if there was a motion to close the public hearing.

Mr. Dunn made a motion to **CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.** Mr. Bradshaw seconded. Upon the call of the roll, the motion passed. **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED.**

Mr. Holger asked if there was any further discussion from the board. A brief discussion regarding the changes to the proposed preliminary plan. The board agreed it was important to preserve the regulated water ways and proposed plan was a good solution.

Mr. Holger asked for a motion on this case.

Mr. Stater made a motion to **approve** of Case ZC19-020 as presented by staff, Mr. Holger seconded. Upon call of the roll: Mr. Holger – yes; Mr. Dunn – yes; Mr. Stater – Yes; Mr. Bradshaw –Yes; Motion approved 4-0

Mr. Holger called for case **ZC19-021: ASI Signage Innovations is requesting a Variance, on behalf of Christ Hospital, from the required Overlay District Ground Sign design requirements**

Mr. Elma presented the staff report, PowerPoint presentation and case materials.

Mr. Holger Asked to hear from the applicant.

Matt Belarge 394 Wards Corner Loveland Ohio stated he represents the owner of Christ hospital. Mr. Berlarge explained the sign is intended as a Gateway sign and tenant sign for the existing Christ Hospital. The sign will also be used for future tenants as the vacant land around the existing facility develops.

Mr. Stater asked for clarification of the materials of the base. Mr. Belarge explained it would be a natural stone or brick.

Bryan Snyder – representative of Christ hospital stated the intent of the sign was to market this corner as a premier healthcare and emergency services facility in Liberty Township. Mr. Snyder explained the sign was designed to complement the proposed Mercy health care sign.

Mr. Holger asked if there was anyone to speak as an opponent of this case. No one spoke

Mr. Holger asked if there was anyone to speak as a neutral party of this of this case. No one spoke

Mr. Holger asked if there was a motion to close the public hearing.

Mr. Bradshaw made a motion to **CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING.** Mr. Stater seconded. Upon the call of the roll, the motion passed. **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED.**

Mr. Holger began the board discussion stating the sign would be a great identity for Liberty Township and the size does complement the proposed sign in West Chester.

Mr. Bradshaw asked for clarification of what portion of the signs counts to the maximum allowed area the sign.

Mr. Elma explained only the portion that are reserved for signage count towards the allowable area. The areas in between the panels do not count towards the square footage.

Mr. Dunn asked for clarification on how the sign would be oriented, and who would see what side. Mr. Holger explained the final orientation has not been determined with the staff review and could be maximized.

Mr. Holger asked for a motion on this case.

Mr. Stater made a motion to **approve** of Case ZC19-021 as presented by staff, Mr. Bradshaw seconded. Upon call of the roll: Mr. Holger – yes; Mr. Dunn – yes; Mr. Stater – Yes; Mr. Bradshaw –Yes; Motion approved 4-0

The Board took a 5 min recess:

Mr. Holger called for case **ZC19-022: Zoning Map Amendment and Preliminary PUD- Carriage Meadows.**

Mr. Elma presented the staff report, PowerPoint presentation and case materials.

Mr. Holger Asked to hear from the applicant.

Richard Arnold – McGill Smith Punchon reviewed findings from the BCEO and explained discrepancies in the in the preliminary PUD and introduced Rick Seitz to discuss the architectural guidelines.

Rick Seitz with John Candle homes introduced John Candle Homes who they were and what they have done. Rick continued with the history of his project and why he decided to request the PUD explaining how it fits into the surrounding area. Mr. Seitz feels he is complying with everything staff recommended; he continued to explain the design of the homes and why he choose to create a craftsman style home which are typically built with vinyl and not brick. Mr. Seitz reviewed his architectural guidelines and why he felt the guidelines would create interesting homes and this development would not be the typical “production builder vinyl home.” Mr. Seitz suggested the township could use the guidelines for future builders to insure quality home for his development and it was a document the township could use as an example to other developers.

Mr. Dunn asked if Mr. Seitz was planning on building the homes or would other builders be allowed to develop lots? Mr. Seitz stated both.

Mr. Dunn asked for clarification about surrounding neighborhoods stating Carriage Hill across the street is all brick. Mr. Seitz clarified he was only referring to the submissions to the east which do have vinyl, Mr. Holger clarified “some vinyl”

Mr. Holger questioned if the homes could be sold for \$350,000 on a quarter of an acer lot with no brick on the house. Mr. Seitz clarified some houses could have brick and that the architectural guidelines were only the proposed vinyl craftsman style homes.

Mr. Holger stated he has a concern with the size of the lots and 4’ side yard setbacks. Mr. Seitz stated he would be willing to change the side yard setback but referenced another neighborhood in Mason (Longcove) that had 5’ side yard setbacks. Stating not everyone wants big yards, and prefer homes with character, thoughtful layouts, and interesting design. Mr. Seitz stated he was willing to comply with staff recommendation for larger side yard setbacks.

Mr. Bradshaw commented that the proposed density of 2.38 DU/AC is a substantial change from the traditional R-PUD, even for a transitional site. He continued by questioning the lack of amenities in the development. Mr. Seitz stated to address that by stating there will be ponds, gazebos, and walking paths, and connectivity of sidewalks into the existing residential and commercial. Mr. Bradshaw stated those are not the typical types of amenities they we see in a R-PUD.

Mr. Dunn restated his concerns about allowing smaller lot sizes without the typical building materials or amenities a typical Liberty Township PUD has. Mr. Seitz responded he does not feel the typical R-PUD is not the type of buyer they are trying to attract.

Mr. Bradshaw asked if the homes came with desk or patios. Mr. Seitz stated yes that would be an option for the homeowner. Mr. Bradshaw expressed his concerns about patios or decks reducing the already small lots. Mr. Seitz feels he is creating a desirable community with a product people want.

Mr. Holger suggested the lots sizes were too small for what the comprehensive vision plan called for. Mr. Holger commented the houses were nice looking but had an issue with them being all vinyl.

Mr. Holger asked if there were any further questions of the applicant. There were no other questions.

Mr. Holger asked if there was anyone to speak as a proponent of this case. None spoke

Mr. Holger asked if there was anyone to speak as an opponent of this case.

- A resident from the adjoining neighborhood spoke in opposition, asking were the kids would play in the small lots. The resident was also concerned about the high density of the small houses on small lots.

Mr. Holger asked if there was anyone to speak as a neutral party of this of this case.

- Todd Hall: 5852 Princeton Glendale Road. Mr. Hall feels it is a unique opportunity to have transition from the commercial on 747 to the residence to the east. Mr. Hall feels this proposal is a good option.

Mr. Holger asked if there was a motion to close the public hearing.

Mr. Dunn made a motion to **CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING**. Mr. Holger seconded. Upon the call of the roll, the motion passed. **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**.

Mr. Dunn felt it would be great to have an integrated master plan that took advantage of the commercial along 747 to have a truly stepdown from the commercial to the west to the estate homes to the east.

Mr. Holger responded they needed to deal with what was in front of them tonight, and is the proposed density a true step down transition as called for by the Liberty Township comprehensive plan.

Mr. Bradshaw stated he is concerned about the amenities are not being proposed that are typically part of a PUD. Mr. Bradshaw recognizes it is a challenging site.

Mr. Dunn made a motion to recommend **denial** of Case ZC19-023 as presented by staff, Mr. Stater seconded. Upon call of the roll: Mr. Holger – yes; Mr. Dunn – yes; Mr. Stater – Yes; Mr. Bradshaw –Yes; Motion to recommend denial 4-0

Holger called for the next item on the agenda, the approval of the meeting minutes from the April 15, 2019. Mr. Holger stated that there is not a quorum of members present at that meeting (Mr. Holger and Mr. Dobrozi were the only two members present in April). Approval of the April minutes would have to be postponed until Mr. Mital or Mr. Bradshaw could attend. Approval was tabled until the next meeting.

Holger asked if there was any other new business. No new Business.

Mr. Dunn made a motion to **ADJOURN ZONING COMMISSION MEETING**. The motion passed unanimously and **ZONING COMMISSION MEETING ADJOURNED**.

Respectfully submitted,

Forrest Holger, Chairman

Mark Elma, Secretary