

**CITY OF MONTGOMERY
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
July 19, 2021**

PRESENT

GUESTS & RESIDENTS

**Tyler Amicon
Viox & Viox
602 Lila Avenue
Milford, OH 45150**

**Greg Joseph
Joseph Auto Group
9770 Montgomery Rd, 45242**

**C. Francis Barrett, Esq.
Barrett & Weber LPA
120 E. 4th Street, Suite 1201
Cincinnati, OH 45202**

**Craig Margolis
Vice Mayor
Montgomery City Council
8270 Mellon Drive, 45242**

**Alex Betsch
Bayer Becker
1404 Race Street, Suite 204
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202**

**Sarah Rumpke
10114 Woodfern Way 45242**

**Kevin Bleichner, RA
Elevar Design Group
555 Carr Street
Cincinnati, OH 45203**

**Mike Willenbrink, PE
Principal
Bayer Becker
6900 Tylersville Rd., 45040**

**Jon Homer
Director of Business Development
Life Enriching Communities
(LEC)
Twin Lakes
6279 Tri-Ridge Blvd.
Suite 320
Loveland, OH 45140**

STAFF

**Tracy Henao, Assistant City
Manager / Acting Community
Development Director**

Karen Bouldin, Secretary

BOARD MEMBERS

**Chairman Mike Harbison
Dennis Hirotsu
Vice Chairman Jim Matre
Barbara Steinebrey
Pat Stull**

BOARD MEMBERS NOT PRESENT

**Vince Dong
Darrell Leibson**

Call to Order

Chairman Harbison called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. He reminded all guests and residents to sign in.

Chairman Harbison explained the process for this evening's meeting to all guests and residents: "Ms. Henao reviews her Staff Report, and the Commission asks any questions they might have. The applicant presents their application, and the Commission then asks any questions. The floor is opened to all residents for comments. If a resident agrees with a comment that was previously stated, they could simply concur, instead of restating the entire comment (to save time). The Commission discusses the application, and residents are not permitted to comment or

Planning Commission Meeting

July 19, 2021

question during this discussion. The Commission will then decide to table, approve or deny the application. Chairman Harbison asked all attending to turn off all cell phones.

Roll Call

The roll was called and showed the following vote:

<i>AYE: Mr. Stull, Mr. Hirotsu, Ms. Steinebrey, Mr. Matre, Chairman Harbison</i>	<i>(5)</i>
<i>NAY:</i>	<i>(0)</i>
<i>ABSENT: Mr. Leibson, Mr. Dong</i>	<i>(2)</i>
<i>ABSTAINED:</i>	<i>(0)</i>

Guests and Residents

There were no guests or residents who wished to speak about items that were not on the agenda.

Old Business

There was no old business to discuss.

New Business (a)

An application from 9722 Montgomery Road, LLC for Final Development Plan approval for the expansion of Performance Audi at 9678 Montgomery Road.

Staff Update

Ms. Henao reviewed the Staff Report dated July 15, 2021, "Application for Audi Connection – Final Development Approval at 9678 Montgomery Road." She pointed out certain topics on the drawing that was shown on the wide screen. Ms. Henao stated that she had not received any phone calls or emails regarding this project.

Mr. Hirotsu asked if the detention basin was required to meet compliance or if was a suggestion. Ms. Henao stated that it was required by the Hamilton County Stormwater Regulations.

There were no other questions. Chairman Harbison asked if the applicant wished to speak.

C. Francis Barrett, Barrett & Weber LPA, 120 E. 4th Street, Suite 1201, Cincinnati, OH 45202 stated that he represented the Audi Connection. He introduced others in attendance: Mr. Greg Joseph, Kevin Bleichner, representing Elevar Design Group, responsible for the architectural work, and Tyler Amicon, representing Viox & Viox, responsible for the site engineering.

Mr. Barrett stated that the applicant worked with Staff and was able to meet all the 9 conditions.

Mr. Barrett stated that regarding stormwater detention / stormwater management, Mr. Tyler Amicon has advised that he can bring the site into compliance.

Planning Commission Meeting

July 19, 2021

Regarding the issue of the lighting, Mr. Barrett stated that, based on the recommendation of their design group, they would like to not put in a second set of light poles on the southern side of the site. They are proposing to use the existing poles and add more light fixtures.

Over a period of weeks, Mr. Barrett stated that he had worked with Mr. Donnellon, the Law Director, and Ms. Henao, regarding the conditions of ownership and management and everyone has signed off. They have met the requirements. He asked for any questions. There were none.

Greg Joseph, Joseph Auto Group, 9770 Montgomery Rd, 45242 thanked the Planning Commission and Staff for all of the work they have done.

Chairman Harbison asked if any guests or residents wished to speak; there were none.

Chairman Harbison closed the meeting for public comment. He asked the Commission for comments.

Mr. Stull was in favor of this application and felt that the applicant has worked hard to meet compliance and the Commission's suggestions. Mr. Hirotsu agreed.

Ms. Steinebrey felt that the change in the landscaping would be extremely nice. It will be much improved along Montgomery Road. She thought it was tremendous that they would use the same lighting between the two properties. She commended them on a great job.

Mr. Matre agreed with the other Commission members and commended the applicant for complying with the Commission's suggestions.

Chairman Harbison was in favor of this application. He liked the landscaping and the larger groups of trees because he felt it would make it a better visual package and help prevent tree leaves and branches from hitting the cars – which causes a maintenance issue for the dealership. He believed it would soften the look.

Mr. Matre moved to approve the application from 9722 Montgomery Road, LLC for the Final Development Plan for the expansion of Performance Audi at 9678 Montgomery Road, in accordance with the conditions set forth in the Staff Report dated July 15, 2021.

These conditions are:

- 1. The applicant must comply with the specific conditions for a conditional use permit listed in Section 151.2007(B) and (W) for auto dealerships and vehicle repair facilities.***
- 2. A Final Development Site Plan in compliance with the approved General Development Plan be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission prior to issuance of any permits.***
- 3. Until such time as the parcels are either consolidated or under common ownership, this Application to allow Parcel 1/9722 to be used as***

Automobile/Truck Sales Agency and Automobile/Truck Rental Agency, Conditional Use, is hereby approved, subject to the following condition: Parcel 1/9722 may be used for Automobile/Truck Sales Agency and Automobile/Truck Rental Agency, so long as both Hamilton County Auditor's Parcel Number 603-0002-0023 (Parcel 1/9722) and Hamilton County Auditor's Parcel Number 603-0002-0039 (Parcel 2/Audi Connection) are used generally as a single Automobile/Truck Sales Agency and Automobile/Truck Rental Agency operating under the same business entity. Parcel 1/ 9722 may not be separated from common control, nor used as a separately approved Conditional Use as an Automobile/Truck Sales Agency and Automobile/Truck Rental Agency without the common control of the Conditional Use by the permit holder of Parcel Hamilton County Auditor's Parcel Number 603-0002-0039. Without common control, or the separate transfer or sale of Parcel 1/9722 from the common operations of the Conditional Use, this approved Conditional Use for Parcel 1/9722 shall automatically terminate. Consistent with the Montgomery Zoning Code the Terms and Duration of the Conditional Use Permit apply to the approved Conditional Use.

- 4. Drive aisles be free of parked vehicles in order to allow for safe access and circulation across the site for customers and safety services.*
- 5. All vehicles for customers, employees and inventory shall be parked on-site with no additional parking on surrounding properties.*
- 6. No loading/unloading of vehicles on Montgomery Road shall be permitted.*
- 7. Inventory and display vehicles shall be parked on identified paved pads or in identified parking stalls only. Display pads shall be limited to nine motor vehicles as shown on the site plan.*
- 8. No inventory shall be parked in spaces reserved for customer parking.*
- 9. Installation of sidewalk along Montgomery Road, in compliance with the Montgomery Road sidewalk standards.*
- 10. The site at 9722 Montgomery Road be brought into compliance with the Hamilton County stormwater regulations and the stormwater management construction drawings shall be approved by the City Engineer.*
- 11. Installation and maintenance of one stormwater best management practice for the property located at 9722 Montgomery Road, as approved by the City Engineer.*
- 12. The final grading plans shall be approved by the City Engineer.*

Planning Commission Meeting

July 19, 2021

13. *The final design for the sidewalk shall be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer and the Public Works Director.*
14. *The lighting plan utilizing shared light poles shall be in effect so long as Audi Connection and Columbia Chevrolet are used simultaneously as automobile dealerships.*
15. *The Final Photometric Plan be reviewed and approved by the Community Development Director prior to issuing any building/zoning permits.*
16. *All light poles to be put on a timer to reduce the average footcandles in the overnight hours as required by Schedule 151.3213(C)(ii).*
17. *The existing ground-mounted sign for the property at 9722 Montgomery Road be removed.*

Mr. Hirotsu seconded the motion.

The roll was called and showed the following vote:

<i>AYE: Mr. Stull, Ms. Steinebrey, Mr. Matre, Mr. Hirotsu, Chairman Harbison</i>	<i>(5)</i>
<i>NAY:</i>	<i>(0)</i>
<i>ABSENT: Mr. Dong, Mr. Leibson</i>	<i>(2)</i>
<i>ABSTAINED:</i>	<i>(0)</i>

This motion is approved.

New Business (b)

An application from Twin Lakes for a Planned Development Overlay District (PD) to be established for the 3.8 acres of property along Montgomery Road at 10120 Montgomery Road to develop thirty independent living units in three buildings.

The applicant is also requesting approval of a General Development Plan (GDP) for the project.

Staff Update

Ms. Henao reviewed the Staff Report dated July 16, 2021, "Application for Planned Development Overlay and General Development Plan Approval for a Multi-Family Residential Planned Development at 10120 Montgomery Road." She showed the drawings on the wide screen to all guests and residents, and referred to some items, as she spoke. She stated that she had not received any phone calls, but did receive one email regarding this project from Mr. Randy Cooper, President of The Myers Y. Cooper Company, who was in support of this project. She asked for any questions.

Regarding the last paragraph on Page 5 of the Staff Report, Mr. Matre asked for clarity on the width of the access drives - what was the difference between 15 feet and 16 feet. Ms. Henao stated that the Zoning Code states that the maximum width for each lane of an access drive is

Planning Commission Meeting

July 19, 2021

15 feet however, 16 feet was being proposed. The Code states that the total drive cannot exceed 40' in width, which this plan meets. She stated that if the Planning Commission felt this was not an issue, they could simply add this as an exception in the list of Conditions and Exceptions. Chairman Harbison stated that the intention of the 15-foot limit per land was to prevent wide drives.

Mr. Matre felt that this was quite unique because it was a boulevard – one way in, one way out.

Mr. Hirotsu asked for the differences between a Planned Development Overlay versus the current zoning. Ms. Henao stated that if this was done under straight zoning, it would allow 6 units/acre, and the application is proposing a little under 9 units per acre. So the PD Overlay allows for extra density, but it also requires 20% open space, which is not required in straight zoning. In this situation, the applicant is also proposing a feature on the corner of Schoolhouse Lane and Montgomery Road to enhance that corner, which is something that is not required.

Mr. Hirotsu asked if, in instances that we offer exceptions relative to a neighbor like Indian Hill, if we consulted them, or if it was just our purview. Ms. Henao stated that Indian Hill was aware of the application, and they have a copy of the application. Staff had also spoken to her Indian Hill counterpart, and he did not have any objections the development.

Mr. Stull asked to see the location of the extra 14 parking spaces. Ms. Henao showed all on the wide screen, the location of the spaces on the General Development Plan. Due to the fact that some of the guest spaces were on-street, Mr. Stull felt that would be a good reason to have the drive a little wider. Chairman Harbison pointed out that those parking spaces would be mostly for the guests because the residents had underground parking.

Mr. Stull asked if the residential parking would all be under the buildings. Ms. Henao stated that they would all have 2 parking spaces per unit.

Ms. Henao stated that the applicant was proposing a list of Conditions and Exceptions dated July 7, 2021. She noted that some of these are like the conditions and exceptions that the City has used for the Vintage Club, Orchard Trail, and most recently, the Villas of Montgomery. She felt that these conditions and exceptions were a bit easier because Twin Lakes will maintain ownership of the entire project instead of parceling out the units. Therefore, there isn't a need for a lot of exceptions to setbacks. Most of the setback exceptions are to allow for slight encroachments for decks, patios, bay windows, stairwells, etc.

Chairman Harbison stated that we did not need an equivalency for these setbacks because it was a Planned Development, not straight zoning. Ms. Henao confirmed, noting that these Conditions and Exceptions essentially become the zoning regulations for this development.

Chairman Harbison asked if there were any more questions from the Board, and there were none. He asked if the applicant wished to speak.

Planning Commission Meeting

July 19, 2021

Jon Homer, Director of Business Development, Life Enriching Communities (LEC), Twin Lakes, 6279 Tri-Ridge Boulevard, Suite 320, Loveland, OH 45140 introduced two Bayer Becker engineers: Alex Betsch and Mike Willenbrink.

Mr. Homer thanked Staff for all of their help, noting that Twin Lakes is in agreement with the Staff Report, as presented this evening. Mr. Homer stated that they have addressed the General Standards that are outlined in the Code.

Mr. Homer explained that in general, Twin Lakes was trying to expand their mission. This was their last parcel in Montgomery, and it has taken over 18 months to get to this point. They feel that this is the best use of this parcel – taking into consideration, the current market climate, as well.

Their mission is to provide for their residents, their best life. Their mission statement is: We provide exceptional everyday experiences in Christian community. He felt that this development was one of the ways they accomplish their mission. He stated that they felt they were the best, the premier provider in the City, through high standards, quality and safety. Mr. Homer felt it was important for people to know their mission.

He explained that they were a non-profit, which means: When you move into their campus, if something happens, and you run out of money, you are not moved out. Benevolent care: last year (2020), Twin Lakes provided over \$1.6 million in benevolent care to their residents. He felt that was a very important part of what they do / offer. He stated that so far in 2021, they have provided \$829,000.

Mr. Homer stated that there is a strong market demand for this product. They have over 100 people on their “Diamond Club Waiting List”. This requires a \$5,000 deposit that people put down just to get on the list. He noted that it would apply toward the entrance fee if they moved in; but it did not get returned if they didn’t move in. Mr. Homer shared more information on their statistics.

He asked for approval for the General Development Plan from the Commission.

Chairman Harbison asked if there were any questions from the Commission.

Mr. Hirotsu asked if they expected any water issues, given all of the complexities of the stormwater running beneath this project.

Mike Willenbrink, PE, Principal, Bayer Becker, 6900 Tylersville Rd., 45040 was confident with their general plan, at this time. He stated that the water will drain from the south to the north. Their plan meets all requirements of Hamilton County, as well as the City’s. He noted that they will probably split the drainage -- some may go towards Montgomery Road, around Building B on the west side, and some will go on the east side of Building B -- both draining to the north.

Planning Commission Meeting

July 19, 2021

Mr. Willenbrink felt that they would likely use an underground detention system, but they may utilize an above ground detention system in the northeast corner. This was still being discussed. He explained that there will be much more detail with the Final Development Plan.

Mr. Hirotsu had concerns that if the plan was approved now, that once they determined the details of the stormwater management plan, the Commission would see a very different plan three months from now.

Mr. Willenbrink stated that they were required to meet the general standards of this General Development Plan. He stated that they were able to utilize stormwater piping to direct the water where they want it to go. For instance, the two catch basins on Schoolhouse Lane outlet into the middle of the site. They will pick that up with a storm pipe, and pipe it to the north, and around Building B. Mr. Willenbrink acknowledged that there are always challenges, but he was confident that they would meet the stormwater requirements and stay within the footprint.

Chairman Harbison liked the site lines, he felt that they allowed pedestrians to look up and see nice homes. He was in favor of this proposal.

Ms. Steinebrey was concerned with Building B and thought it felt too large to be on Montgomery Road. She asked if they could take one story off of it, and make Building C a little longer. She felt Building B was too close to Montgomery Road since it was a three-story building and pointed out that, as you travel down Montgomery Road, there is no other place with a three-story building that close to the road. She stated that she felt it would just jump out at you; that it may look like an eyesore.

Mr. Homer stated that Building B was turned perpendicular to Montgomery Road; he showed that it was at least 35 feet from Montgomery Road, and even 20 feet to the east. They will actually be 45 feet from Montgomery Road. He pointed out that there will also be landscaping along Montgomery Road.

Chairman Harbison suggested moving the building further away from Montgomery Road and flipping the underground garage opening to the other side, because of the topography. He stated that it would allow the underground access, and might reduce the impact, if you move it back a little bit further. Mr. Homer stated that the reason they were entering in on that side, was because it is lower, and enabled them to get underneath the building. The west side would be a bit of a problem for an underground parking garage.

Chairman Harbison felt if you could move it back even 5 feet, it would give it a nice gradual site line.

Mike Willenbrink stated that another challenge was grading - they have roughly an 11 foot difference from the first floor to the lower level. In a typical house, you don't have that much. He showed members on the wide screen, how they would grade the drive down, but because of the parallel parking, it will still be relatively flat in the front. They will continue to make it a slow grade to ensure water would not flow into the garage. He explained details to the members, and pointed them out on the wide screen. There was more discussion.

Planning Commission Meeting

July 19, 2021

Regarding Building B, Mr. Willenbrink was not sure if they could move it back 5 feet, but he would investigate it, also noting that they needed to maintain a certain slope to allow for safety service vehicles to enter the garage. Ms. Henao stated that there is some landscaping area where they could put in some shade trees that would soften the site line, as you travel north on Montgomery Road. Mr. Willenbrink stated that he would look into 5 foot change, and could let the Commission know at the Final Development Plan.

Mr. Stull didn't feel it would be an issue.

Ms. Henao reminded the Commissioners that even if this was not a Planned Development, that a building 45 feet in height was permitted in the district. She noted that it was actually only 10 feet higher than what is allowed for a single-family home.

Chairman Harbison asked if the applicant would investigate it moving Building B back 5 feet. Mr. Willenbrink stated that he would attempt to look at it right now.

Chairman Harbison asked if any guests or residents had any questions or comments.

Sarah Rumpke, 10114 Woodfern Way, Montgomery, OH 45242 asked if the Overlay permanently travelled with the community – for example, if Twin Lakes sold the property to be redeveloped, would those rules still apply. Ms. Henao stated that the overlay district would remain in place only for this project.

Ms. Rumpke agreed with Ms. Steinebrey, that 3 stories was quite a tall building to see when you were entering a residential community. She felt it was a really tall building, and liked the idea of 2 stories, when you were approaching a residential community. She asked if they could bury the 3 story building further down, into the grade.

Ms. Rumpke was also concerned about the building materials that would be used. It was her understanding that Montgomery did not have any say in the choice of exterior building materials. She asked if the applicant would present these materials at some point, for residents to have a say in what it would look like. Her intention was that it would be appropriate for a residential area.

Ms. Rumpke spoke on behalf of herself and her neighbors on Forestglen, when expressing that there was much alarm regarding stormwater mitigation. She stated that it would directly affect them because that swale comes from Forestglen. They were concerned with water back-up in their basements.

Ms. Rumpke lastly wanted to remind the Commission that most people who move into Twin Lakes do not have earned income and are not contributing earned income tax to the City of Montgomery.

Chairman Harbison stated that the Commission did look at building materials. Ms. Henao pointed out that the Commission will review building materials at the Final Development Plan stage; however, this property is not subject to the Montgomery Road Commercial Corridor Design Guidelines, which ends south of Schoolhouse Lane. She added that that, from her

Planning Commission Meeting

July 19, 2021

discussions with Twin Lakes, they plan to have building materials similar to those of their main campus and villa homes. Ms. Henao believed they would be high quality. Ms. Rumpke appreciated that. Ms. Henao noted that Twin Lakes will have the building materials, as well as the elevations, at the Final Development Plan meeting so Ms. Rumpke could see it in more detail.

Ms. Rumpke was also concerned about the people who were building in the Meadows of Peterloon, albeit was in the Village of Indian Hill. She asked if the buyers of those two lots were aware that a 3 story building was proposed right in front of them. Ms. Henao stated that the City has sent notifications to anyone who resides within 300 feet of this application and that included the new owners of Lots 1-3.

Ms. Rumpke asked if the developer could address how the land will be graded. Ms. Henao showed her on the wide screen, and explained, noting there will be some excavation as well. Mr. Willenbrink also explained their thoughts about grading and drainage at this point and noted that they will meet the requirements.

Mr. Homer stated that per Mr. Willenbrink's calculations they would be able to slide Building B 5 feet to the west and this would be shown in the Final Development Plan.

Ms. Steinebrey was delighted and appreciated that they had addressed her concern so quickly. She pointed out that with every project Twin Lake have previously done, the landscaping was spectacular. She knew they would do a great job with landscaping on this project as well. Chairman Harbison agreed, stating that Twin Lakes was one of the few that maintained their landscaping without needing a nudge.

Chairman Harbison closed the meeting to the public comment and asked the Commission for their thoughts.

Mr. Stull and Mr. Hirotsu stated that they were in favor of this application.

Ms. Steinebrey loved the design of one-way in and one-way out. She thought that this would be a great look. Chairman Harbison agreed, it should allow for a good traffic flow.

Mr. Matre was in favor of 16 feet in width for the driveways instead of the 15 feet. Mr. Stull agreed. Ms. Henao stated that if all of the Commissioners agreed with this, they could add a statement under the General Conditions for the Planned Development, that the entry drive shall be 16 feet in width.

Mr. Hirotsu didn't think this needed to be 16 feet, when the Vintage Club was only 15 feet. Ms. Henao felt that the entryway at the Vintage Club was significantly wider, maybe about 24 on each side. She noted that 15-foot requirement was for a residential use and not a commercial, mixed use project.

Mr. Homer stated that they had a potential solution. Mr. Willenbrink stated that right now, they have the driveway, with parallel parking off to the side of it. One approach could be to increase

Planning Commission Meeting

July 19, 2021

the islands, to get the 15 feet in the islands, and put the extra foot for the parallel parking.

Mr. Hirotsu was more concerned about setting precedent, and now that he understood this would not be the case, he no longer had any concern in agreeing with 16 feet.

All Commission members agreed with the 16 feet.

Mr. Matre moved that the Planning Commission recommend that City Council approve the Planned Development Overlay and the list of Conditions and Exceptions and approve the General Development Plan with the following conditions:

- 1. A Final Development Site Plan, in compliance with the approved General Development Plan, be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission prior to issuance of any permits.***
- 2. Building B will be setback 50 feet from Montgomery Road.***
- 3. Access to the site shall be from the boulevard entrance off Schoolhouse Lane with no new curb cuts on Montgomery Road, as shown on the General Development Plan dated July 7, 2021.***
- 4. An exception be made in the List of Conditions and Exceptions to allow for the width of the access drives off Schoolhouse Lane to be a maximum of 16 feet in width, in compliance with the General Development Plan dated July 7, 2021.***

Mr. Steinebrey seconded the motion.

The roll was called and showed the following vote:

<i>AYE: Mr. Hirotsu, Ms. Steinebrey, Mr. Matre, Mr. Stull, Chairman Harbison</i>	<i>(5)</i>
<i>NAY:</i>	<i>(0)</i>
<i>ABSENT: Mr. Leibson, Mr. Dong</i>	<i>(2)</i>
<i>ABSTAINED:</i>	<i>(0)</i>

This motion is approved.

Staff Report

Ms. Henao reported on the following topics:

Montgomery Quarter: There will be a closure on Montgomery Road, at the roundabout. It will start late this Friday night and all-day Saturday, reopening early on Sunday.

They are putting together a request for qualifications for looking at the landscaping for the center of the roundabout, as well as for the landscaping leading up to the roundabout.

They are beginning discussions about programming the park at Montgomery Quarter, which should be open by the late spring of 2022.

Planning Commission Meeting

July 19, 2021

DORA event: planned for Saturday, August 21 from 6 p.m. to 9 p.m., on Remington Road from Montgomery Road to the Montgomery Public House driveway.

There will be a food truck and band. You can walk around with drinks outside, and there will be some games as well.

Next Planning Commission meeting: nothing for August 1. The Joseph team / Chevrolet Final Development Plan will not be ready until September.

Community Director candidate: hope to be able to announce a new hire within the next 2 weeks.

Mr. Matre asked why Weller Road will be closing. Ms. Henao stated that the Ohio Department of Transportation is replacing the bridge over I-275 on Weller Road, and it must be closed during construction.

Council Report

Vice Mayor Margolis wanted to thank the Commissioners who helped out on Saturday – for such a great event. He thanked Staff for organizing the event and having the foresight to hold an event when much of the events in the northeast part of Cincinnati are still cancelled due to the pandemic.

Vice Mayor Margolis noted that he had the honor of welcoming Mr. Dong and Mr. Matre to the Volunteer Walk of Fame. He congratulated Ms. Steinebrey, as well. He thanked them for their attentiveness to our community and their time on this Commission. He reported that their bricks on the walk of fame were well-deserved.

Vice Mayor Margolis stated that a comment was made tonight about people who do not pay earnings tax to the city, and shared that he and his wife fit in that category. He pointed out that while they don't pay earnings tax, they still pay their real estate tax, as does Twin Lakes. He stated that we have to watch out when residents try and hold people in different categories for some sort of reason. He reminded Commissioners that it is not the purview of this Commission. Your purview is to determine the request, based on how the plan fits into the community; and as Ms. Steinebrey also brought up – the look and feel of the project.

Mr. Margolis stated that on Wednesday they will be teeing up for the following week, regarding legislation that will consolidate the two access points at 9305 and 9321 Montgomery Road (Avis Rental and Dunkin locations) into one access point. Eliminating curb cuts does so much to help with the safety of pedestrians and vehicular traffic. He noted that anytime the Planning Commission was able to accomplish this, it was a plus.

Mr. Margolis will attend the Strategic Plan Retreat, to be held at the end of August. He stated that this was also the end and the simultaneous beginning of a 5-year strategic plan.

At the last Planning Commission meeting, Mr. Margolis had a conversation with a guest who was a resident from Indian Hill, and had a major concern about our Montgomery Quarter project. The resident described a rumor that had been circulating that the project was several feet into

Planning Commission Meeting

July 19, 2021

Indian Hill, and the neighbors said they didn't understand why Indian Hill didn't support their property rights. Mr. Margolis checked into this with Staff, only to find out that the project was fully on Montgomery property. He then relayed this information to the Indian Hill resident. Mr. Margolis referred to a recent Landmarks meeting, where a lengthy discussion focused around windows – for the Montgomery Quarter apartments. Ultimately, they did not approve of the samples shown, and are still in search of something that replicates the look and feel of wood.

Mr. Margolis asked if anyone had any questions.

Mr. Hirotsu asked if there was any insight on the dilemmas that the City faces at the upcoming Strategic Plan. Mr. Margolis stated that he would bring it back to this Commission when he gets the big picture.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Matre moved to approve the minutes of May 3, 2021, as written.

Mr. Stull seconded the motion. The Commission unanimously approved the minutes.

Adjournment

Mr. Hirotsu moved to adjourn. Mr. Steinebrey seconded the motion.

The meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.



Karen Bouldin, Clerk

 15 NOV 2021

Michael Harbison, Chairman Date

/ksb