

These minutes are a draft of the proposed minutes from the Planning Commission meeting. They do not represent the official record of proceedings until formally adopted by the Planning Commission. Formal adoption is noted by signature of the Chair, within the Minutes.

**CITY OF MONTGOMERY
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING**

City Hall, 10101 Montgomery Road, Montgomery, OH 45242

January 18, 2022

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

<u>PRESENT</u>		
<u>GUESTS & RESIDENTS</u>		<u>STAFF</u>
LeeAnn Bissmeyer Vice Mayor Montgomery City Council	Jim & Mary Ann Hoffman 7511 Cornell Rd., 45242	Tracy Henao Assistant City Manager Kevin Chesar Community Development Director
Paul Balent Board President Sycamore Schools 5959 Hagewa Drive Blue Ash, OH 45242	Charlie Jahnigen Architect SHP 312 Plum Street Suite 700 Cincinnati, OH 45202	Karen Bouldin, Secretary <u>ALL COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT</u> Chairman Jim Matre Vince Dong Dennis Hirotsu Darrell Leibson
Dan Behnfeldt Architect SHP 312 Plum Street Suite 700 Cincinnati, OH 45202	Kelly Kolar President & Founder Kolar Design 807 Broadway, 5 th Floor Cincinnati, OH 45202	<u>MEMBERS NOT PRESENT</u> Barbara Steinebrey Pat Stull
Brad D'Agnillo Civil Engineer The Kleingers Group 6219 Centre Park Drive West Chester, OH 45069	Chad Lewis Superintendent Sycamore Schools 5959 Hagewa Drive Blue Ash, OH 45242	
Gerri Franks 7673 Cornell Rd., 45242 Rob & Diana Goetz 7588 Lakewater Dr, 45242	Brad Lovell Director of Business & Operations Sycamore Schools 5959 Hagewa Drive Blue Ash, OH 45242	
Ann Henry / Jim Sykes 7960 Remington, 45242		

8
9

These minutes are a draft of the proposed minutes from the Planning Commission meeting. They do not represent the official record of proceedings until formally adopted by the Planning Commission. Formal adoption is noted by signature of the Chair, within the Minutes.

Planning Commission Meeting

January 18, 2022

10 **Call to Order**

11 Chairman Matre called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. He reminded all guests and residents to
12 sign in, and please turn off all cell phones.

13
14 **Roll Call**

15
16 *The roll was called and showed the following response:*

17
18 *PRESENT: Mr. Hirotsu, Mr. Leibson, Mr. Dong, Chairman Matre (4)*

19 *ABSENT: Ms. Steinebrey, Mr. Stull (2)*

20
21 **Guests and Residents**

22 Chairman Matre asked if there were any guests or residents who wished to speak about items that
23 were not on the agenda. There were none.

24
25 Chairman Matre explained the process for this evening's meeting to all guests and residents:
26 "Mr. Chesar reviews his Staff Report and the Commission asks any questions they might have.
27 The applicant presents their application and the Commission then asks any questions. The floor
28 is opened to all residents for comments. If a resident agrees with a comment that was previously
29 stated, they could simply concur, instead of restating the entire comment to save time. The
30 Commission discusses the application and residents are not permitted to comment or question
31 during this discussion. The Commission will then decide to table, approve or deny the
32 application.

33
34 **Old Business**

35 There was no old business to report.

36
37 **New Business - 1**

38 *Application from Jim Sykes and Ann Henry for a General Development Plan approval for an*
39 *attached single-family structure at 7960 Remington Road.*

40
41 **Staff Report**

42 Mr. Chesar reviewed the Staff Report dated January 14, 2022, "General Development Plan for a
43 Single-Family Attached Residential Development at 7960 Remington Road." He noted that
44 because this property was located in the Heritage District, it would also require approval by the
45 Landmarks Commission, once it moved through Planning Commission and Board of Zoning
46 Appeals (BZA). He showed the drawings on the wide screen to all. Mr. Chesar asked for any
47 questions, noting that the applicants were present to answer any questions, and that they both had
48 extensive architectural and construction backgrounds.

49
50 Mr. Dong stated that there appeared to be a new curb cut in addition to the current curb cut, and
51 asked if that followed Code, for residential. He was concerned because it was a busy road. Mr.
52 Chesar stated that he would check into the code regulations prior to the final development plan.

53

Planning Commission Meeting

January 18, 2022

54 **Ann Henry, 7960 Remington Road, Montgomery, OH, 45242** stated that it was not a new
55 curb cut, she had just labeled it as that; it was actually just where the driveway ended. Mr. Dong
56 confirmed that it was a second entrance from the main road.

57
58 Mr. Hirotsu asked about the process, and if this was typical that this application would carry on
59 from Planning Commission, then to BZA, on to Landmarks. Mr. Chesar stated due to side yard
60 setback variance necessary and location within the Heritage Overlay District, the process is
61 correct. As a General Development Plan, the Commissioners are reviewing for an overall
62 understanding of layout. He noted that if the applicant received approval this evening, it would
63 allow them to move forward to request a variance.

64
65 Mr. Leibson clarified that the Planning Commission's approval would be contingent on the next
66 board's approval.

67
68 As there were no more questions for Staff, Chairman Matre asked if the applicants wished to
69 speak.

70
71 **Ann Henry and James Sykes, 7960 Remington Road, Montgomery, OH, 45242** stepped up to
72 speak. Ms. Henry stated that this was a revised plan, based on the feedback from the Planning
73 Commission last fall, when they were requesting a zoning change, and it didn't seem like it
74 would happen. She explained that this revision was the alternative to placing 3 buildings on the
75 site, as it fit within the zoning.

76
77 Mr. Hirotsu asked if they could shift the structure, so that the out-of-compliance was on the west
78 side, instead of the east side. Ms. Henry stated that it seemed to fit better on the side that
79 parallels to the eastern line. Mr. Sykes stated that the western side had a very sharp drop-off,
80 going towards the apartment complex next door, which also had a failing retaining wall. Ms.
81 Henry stated that she hadn't looked at it from that perspective and they could further explore the
82 option. Mr. Leibson stated that you could see that it wouldn't work. Mr. Hirotsu asked how far
83 the existing structure was from the west lot line. Mr. Sykes stated it may be 10 feet, if that. Ms.
84 Henry stated that they were shifting it away from the west side, and were basically centering it
85 more on the property.

86
87 Mr. Hirotsu pointed out that there was a multi-family neighbor on the west side and a single
88 family on the right/east. He was concerned that the applicant would get challenged by the
89 single-family owners. Ms. Henry stated that she had discussed this with the neighbor, and he
90 was fine with it.

91
92 Chairman Matre asked, and there were no more questions from the Commission.

93
94 Chairman Matre asked if there were any guests or residents who wished to speak on this
95 application. There were none.

96

These minutes are a draft of the proposed minutes from the Planning Commission meeting. They do not represent the official record of proceedings until formally adopted by the Planning Commission. Formal adoption is noted by signature of the Chair, within the Minutes.

Planning Commission Meeting

January 18, 2022

97 Chairman Matre closed the public portion of this meeting, and asked for deliberation among the
98 Commission.
99

100 Mr. Dong was in favor of this drawing, and felt it fit in the neighborhood; but he was still
101 concerned about the access point, and wanted verification on that. Ms. Henao stated that they
102 had sent this application to the Public Works Director, who did not raise any concerns, so she
103 believed that it was in compliance, but would still double-check.
104

105 Mr. Leibson like this plan, felt this was what Montgomery was looking for. He was in favor. He
106 asked Mr. Chesar about the 35% impervious surface, and was concerned this might present a
107 drainage issue. He asked if this was part of the Zoning Code. Mr. Chesar stated that it was and
108 that the site appears to meet regulations but staff will confirm the front yard area. He noted that
109 most zoning codes have a maximum coverage that is permitted on the lot. It relates to drainage,
110 but also the value of open space / greenspace; and not allowing an entire lot or front yard to be
111 paved.
112

113 Mr. Hirotsu was in favor of this and wanted to commend the applicants for hearing all of
114 Commission's previous comments.
115

116 Chairman Matre agreed with all other Commissioners, and was in favor.
117

118 ***Mr. Leibson made a motion to approve the application from Jim Sykes and Ann Henry for a***
119 ***General Development Plan for an attached single-family structure at 7960 Remington Road,***
120 ***based on the revised, submitted drawings dated December 20, 2021, with the following***
121 ***conditions:***

- 122 ***1. Staff comments of verification for the front yard impervious surface coverage***
- 123 ***2. Board of Zoning Appeals' approval of side-yard setback***
- 124 ***3. Building, architectural materials, and colors be approved by Landmarks Commission.***
- 125 ***4. Code verification of two access points for the two single families.***
126

127
128 ***Mr. Hirotsu seconded the motion.***
129

130 ***The roll was called and showed the following vote:***
131

132 ***AYE: Mr. Dong, Mr. Hirotsu, Mr. Leibson, Chairman Matre*** (4)

133 ***NAY:*** (0)

134 ***ABSENT: Ms. Steinebrey, Mr. Stull*** (2)

135 ***ABSTAINED:*** (0)
136

137 ***This motion is approved.***
138

139 **New Business - 2**

Planning Commission Meeting

January 18, 2022

140 *An application from SHP, on behalf of Sycamore Community Schools for Final Development*
141 *Site Plan approval for modifications to the existing High School and construction of a new*
142 *stadium at 7400 Cornell Road.*

Staff Report

144
145 Mr. Chesar reviewed the Staff Report dated January 14, 2022, “Expansion of Conditional Use
146 and Final Development Plan Approval for Sycamore High School at 7400 Cornell Road.”
147 He showed the site plans on the wide screen, as he reviewed.

148
149 He noted that he did not receive any written correspondence from the neighbors, but he did
150 receive a phone call from the property owner at 11048 Valley Stream, who was unable to attend.
151 The owner stated that she has been a resident for a number of years, and expressed concerns
152 about traffic, effects on the property values, and questioned why the stadium was moved on-site,
153 from where previously shown. She was also concerned about the noise and possible trash left on
154 her property. She stated that after games, she has seen trash on her property.

155
156 Mr. Chesar also received an inquiry from another resident, simply interested in the plans, who
157 did not make any comment.

158
159 Mr. Hirotsu wanted to see the proposed sidewalk location on the drawings on the screen.
160 Staff showed this, pointing out that people will still walk where they want to. The school’s
161 intent is still to have students walk down Cornell and cross at the existing sidewalk, and then
162 cross into the main campus, and access into the relocated entrance. He showed the route and
163 plan for safe pedestrian connections.

164
165 Mr. Hirotsu asked what comments the Traffic Engineer had. Mr. Chesar stated that he had
166 generally approved the traffic impact study, and had made a comment that there were a few
167 minor issues; and the City was currently working through them, but there were no major
168 outstanding issues.

169
170 Mr. Chesar felt this plan was an improvement to the current access, because they are separating
171 the two left-turn movements from the right turn movement, from those coming westbound.

172
173 Ms. Heno stated that the Traffic Impact Study did indicate that a dedicated right turn lane into
174 this new drive would be required, which will be installed as part of the project. This will help to
175 eliminate a huge amount of traffic.

176
177 Mr. Hirotsu asked if the 3,050 stadium capacity was limited, because of the fire capacity.
178 Mr. Chesar deferred to the applicant.

179
180 Mr. Leibson felt the wording “no additional, large events” held any meaning, and did not know
181 how this could be defined or enforced. He understood the intent. Mr. Chesar felt that the City
182 could define it, as it would relate to the parking requirements. If there are parking issues, that
183 will be the first sign. Mr. Chesar agreed that the wording was nebulous but felt it could be

Planning Commission Meeting

January 18, 2022

184 monitored. The parking reduction is in part due to the school's refinement of expected
185 attendance, cost savings and moving parking away from Cornell while being closer to the
186 stadium. The stadium is also being relocated in order to preserve the location of the softball and
187 baseball fields.

188
189 Mr. Jahnigen stated that he has worked very closely with the City's Traffic Engineers on the
190 proposed plan. Today, everyone comes into the same entrance and it is not efficient. He stated
191 that the plan actually has 3 entrance points: The western most point will be for buses and staff
192 and only. The bus drop off is right there. The middle access point will be for folks coming from
193 the west – from the Blue Ash side of the district. The parents have a dedicated drop off for their
194 children. From the east entrance, people will come from Symmes Township and City of
195 Montgomery. The goal is to get students off the road efficiently, to drive slower on the district
196 property; and provide a loop(s) for parents to drop off.

197
198 Mr. Jahnigen referred to the light heights of 80 feet. He stated that Cincinnati Hills Christian
199 Academy, north of the site, has 80 foot lights, so does Loveland. Indian Hill, Madeira and
200 Mason have a variety of 70-80 foot lights. He pointed out that LED stadium lights have
201 improved greatly and can be directionally aimed. They are also controlled by District cell
202 phones, so they can be controlled at any time, from various locations, without needing to go to
203 the school.

204
205 Mr. Jahnigen stated that the number of 3,050 was driven by the seating count. They will provide
206 plumbing for that amount, and they will provide proper egress with a 6 foot security fence to be
207 in accordance with fire code, in the event of an emergency.

208
209 He asked if there were any questions.

210
211 Mr. Dong asked why they reduced the number from 4200 seats to 3,050. Mr. Jahnigen stated
212 that it was due to cost – which allowed a 27% reduction. This brought down the cost for
213 bleachers, plumbing and parking. He stated that the school felt confident that 3,050 would work.

214
215 Mr. Dong asked about the traffic on Cornell and Cooper and would this plan help alleviate
216 issues.

217
218 Mr. Jahnigen stated that the traffic simulation they have done with their traffic engineers and
219 with the City of Montgomery traffic engineers shows that it will elevate some of the pressure.
220 Naturally there will still be build-up at certain times – when everyone arrives at the same time.
221 But the right hand turn lane will also eliminate traffic. He pointed out that the biggest difference
222 will show because those entrance points will be one point of entry (for the most part), and you
223 won't have the stop/start with the police officers directing. Mr. Jahnigen stated that the analysis
224 and modelling show that it will be a dramatic improvement.

225
226 Mr. Dong asked about possibly shielding these 80 foot lights. Mr. Jahnigen stated the Sycamore
227 Soccer stadium has LED lights. He stated that there should not be any light spillage because

These minutes are a draft of the proposed minutes from the Planning Commission meeting. They do not represent the official record of proceedings until formally adopted by the Planning Commission. Formal adoption is noted by signature of the Chair, within the Minutes.

Planning Commission Meeting

January 18, 2022

228 these lights are geared to aim at specific areas. Mr. Dong was concerned with it being on the
229 hill. Mr. Jahnigen pointed out that they have provided foot candles layouts for the field and the
230 seats, as well as property lines but go down .51 or .5 beyond the footprint of the fence.

231
232 Mr. Hirotsu was confused and concerned about the many different heights of the light fixtures,
233 reading from page 6 of the Staff Report, under Stadium: “Four stadium light poles at a height of
234 80’ are proposed with 62 fixtures installed that range in height locations at 20’, 25’, 30’, 35’ to
235 illuminate the field and bleacher areas. Mr. Chesar stated that these were fixtures mounted at
236 different heights, on the same pole. Mr. Jahnigen stated that he would follow-up on that, noting
237 that they were fairly condensed at the top. He stated that there were lights at 35 feet that were
238 aimed at the bleachers.

239
240 Mr. Hirotsu asked about the drop off. Mr. Jahnigen showed a different site plan, and showed all
241 how it would work. He emphasized that the District will have to work very closely with the
242 parents. He noted that they have diagrams up everywhere, colors and arrows, showing pick-up
243 and drop-off. He felt that by the end of one week, most everyone would be accustomed to it.

244
245 Mr. Hirotsu pointed out that for about 5 days of the year, the neighbors would see more traffic
246 (from the stadium), and the other 220 days, they would see a lot less traffic on that road.

247
248 Mr. Hirotsu asked how you determine the number of attendees at a game. Mr. Jahnigen stated
249 that is controlled by ticket sales – which are all digital. Generally, Sycamore attracts about 2,000
250 folks to a good-sized game. If they go over, you are pushing parking capacity that would
251 frustrate the attendees.

252
253 Mr. Dong asked about mitigating noise. Mr. Jahnigen pointed out that there will be a PA and
254 speakers for the stadium that will be directionally hung and engineered so that the sound was
255 pointed toward the stands, and some lead-off to the field. They will work very hard to make sure
256 that decibel levels beyond the property line are satisfactory. Currently, there are soccer fields on
257 the north portion of the site, which have speakers. He was not aware of how many complaints
258 the City had received.

259
260 Mr. Dong asked about additional landscaping, as screening for the neighbors. Mr. Jahnigen
261 stated that they did exceeded requirements; the majority of it was on the southern portion, and it
262 will screen sound and also buffer the lighting.

263
264 Mr. Hirotsu asked if they were amenable to all of the conditions laid out in the Staff Report.
265 Mr. Jahnigen confirmed that they were, noting that the conditions that were laid out were
266 reasonable to work with.

267
268 **Chad Lewis, Superintendent, Sycamore Schools, 5959 Hagewa Drive, Blue Ash, OH 45242**
269 thanked the Commissioners for their consideration. He felt that with all of the significant things
270 they were doing in the District, these were also significant upgrades for the entire community.

Planning Commission Meeting

January 18, 2022

271 He stated that they wanted to be good neighbors and good partners. He stated that for the
272 resident who was concerned with trash in her yard, they would be happy to help, if that happens.
273

274 Mr. Lewis stated that it was the first time since 1975 for the students to have their field, and their
275 team playing at their high school, and not offsite. He was excited about all of these upgrades,
276 and stated that they will do whatever they can to ensure that this project is a positive for the
277 community.
278

279 Mr. Lewis also wanted to thank Mr. Harbison who had contributed so much over the years, as
280 Chairman of the Planning Commission.
281

282 Chairman Matre asked if there were any guests or residents who wished to speak.
283

284 **Gerri Franks, 7673 Cornell Road, Montgomery, OH 45242** stated that she was not thrilled
285 with this project, as it would be right across the street from her home, with a detention basin as
286 the only buffer between her and the stadium. She hoped it would look better than it sounded.
287 Ms. Franks realized the purpose of the basin was to keep the water runoff from flooding her
288 home, which is downhill from where the stadium will be. Her final concern was the tornado
289 memorial, which is currently on the property, and she asked what would happen to it.
290

291 Ms. Henao stated that it may be needed to be relocated, but if so, it would be just slightly moved.
292 She confirmed that they will maintain and keep it onsite.
293

294 **Rob Goetz, 7588 Lakewater Drive, Montgomery, OH 45242** stated that he lived one block off
295 of Valley Stream. He noted that with all of the talk about traffic impact, no one has addressed
296 the impact into the subdivision to the south. Valleystream, Shadowhill, Deersshadow – all of
297 those streets to the south were impacted. He asked, that when students come out of the exit,
298 what will stop them from taking Valleystream, and driving back into that subdivision? He asked
299 for their thoughts.
300

301 **Brad D’Agnillo, Civil Engineer, The Kleingers Group, 6219 Centre Park Drive, West**
302 **Chester, OH 45069** stated that they had studied the intersection at Valleystream to track the
303 count during arrival and dismissal times. He noted that they will still have police officers
304 working both entrances, at arrival, and one during dismissal, so anyone who is trying to get
305 across to Valleystream, or out of Valleystream, will have a chance to get out.
306

306 Mr. Getz was not worried about them getting out, he was concerned with them coming in.
307

308 Mr. Lewis stated that obviously students use multiple avenues when they leave the high school
309 now. He stated that they could not prevent students from leaving the campus and driving
310 wherever they may, to different parts of the community. He did not believe this project would
311 increase traffic coming off of the site, utilizing that area, unless they lived in that area.
312

312 He believed that one of those avenues actually had a “No Thru Traffic” sign, all of the way on
313 the other side of Pfeiffer, when you come up through Storybook. He deferred to the City, for a
314 response.

Planning Commission Meeting

January 18, 2022

315

316 Mr. Getz didn't see how you could do a study where the students have access directly across the
317 street, going down Valleystream. He agreed that it was a long way around, but it opened up a
318 new access point into his neighborhood, right there in front of them. He didn't understand how
319 they could do a study, and say that there would not be more traffic coming down through his
320 neighborhood. Mr. Leibson stated that Mr. Getz was making an assumption, based on the fact
321 that because the exit would be placed right across from Valleystream, there would be more
322 traffic on their street; it may not be true.

323

324 Mr. Jahnigen stated that there is a right-hand turn lane, from Cornell, to get into that new
325 entrance. When you are exiting, there is a dedicated left-hand turn lane, so you turn left onto
326 Cornell. There is another one that will have an arrow to go straight onto Valley Stream, for those
327 who need to; and a right to go westbound. He stated that there will be a police officer there
328 during dismissal, so he could control them from going straight.

329

330 **Diana Goetz, 7588 Lakewater Dive, Montgomery, OH 45242** stated that she works at
331 Bethesda North Hospital. In the morning, she turns onto Valleystream, and already they are
332 turning right. Sometimes she gets delayed with the current traffic and the stop signs, trying to
333 turn right onto Cornell. She stated that her neighborhood is a cut-through neighborhood that
334 offers alternate routes, and there are a lot of students that already take advantage of that - because
335 it is an access point to many other different locations. She hopes that if there is a policeman
336 there, he can help her get out to work.

337

338 Mrs. Goetz was also concerned with people parking on both sides of the street on Valleystream,
339 Lakewater and Shadowhill, when there are games. She noted that these are two-lane roads, and
340 if this occurs it will be hazardous driving there. She asked if there was any thought of making
341 no-parking zones throughout the neighborhood to make it safer.

342

343 Mr. Chesar stated that the City is aware of that issue, and they will evaluate it, as the activities
344 occur. He stated that there is an ability to "sign" it for no-parking purposes, but we want to
345 evaluate that when it occurs. He noted that the issue was not for Planning Commission, but for
346 the City to undertake. Ms. Henaio stated that there were the same concerns in the Delray
347 neighborhood, with the stadium in the Junior High campus, and they did "sign" the streets, which
348 helped to alleviate the problem. She stated that they will closely monitor this, when the new
349 stadium comes in, and can sign the streets on one side, being sure that residents and safety
350 services can get through, with no blockage.

351

352 There were no more comments from guests or residents. Chairman Matre closed the public
353 session and asked the Commissioners to discuss.

354

355 Mr. Dong liked the application; he liked the crosswalk and the sidewalk that was recommended
356 by the City, and felt it should be added. Mr. Dong asked about the 40% impervious surface, and
357 asked if we needed to place a maximum for that – he did not want it to be 50%. Mr. Chesar
358 stated that the Commission was authorized to go up to 50%, but he felt that 43% would not be

Planning Commission Meeting

January 18, 2022

359 excessive.

360 Ms. Henao stated that if they did a 4-foot sidewalk, which is minimum, and it was 500 lineal
361 feet, it would add about 2,000 square feet of impervious surface. Mr. Chesar stated that the pad
362 for the ambulance may impact it, as well. Ms. Henao agreed, that to give it a number at 43%, it
363 would allow for leeway.

364
365 Mr. Dong wanted to be sure that there was flexibility to get shielding for the lights, if needed.
366 He wanted to be considerate of the neighbors. Mr. Jahnigen stated that they would work with the
367 City on traffic, and lighting and sound, based on the first year of operations.

368
369 Mr. Leibson agreed with Mr. Dong on the conditions, and the 43%. He also wanted to address
370 the neighbors' concerns about cut-through traffic. He felt that the City should really work on not
371 disrupting this neighborhood any more. He would urge Staff to really work with the Traffic
372 Engineer or whomever (perhaps do traffic counts) to help the neighborhood. Mr. Chesar stated
373 that they would work closely with the police department and the schools to help prevent this.

374
375 Mr. Hirotsu recalled a condition that was placed at a previous meeting about parking. He asked
376 if that was in this proposal. Ms. Henao stated that it is still a condition from the General
377 Development Plan, so it will carry over. She explained that all of the conditions that were part
378 of the GDP will carry over into this. The applicant will need to come back after the stadium has
379 been in operation for a full year.

380
381 Mr. Hirotsu stated that the condition was made regarding the attendance / parking. He would
382 like to add to that - a look at the traffic flow, and pedestrian flow. He would like to have a
383 formal report back on that, from the school. There was more discussion, and Ms. Henao noted
384 that this was actually more of an administration effort, not Planning Commission's purview.
385 It would be followed up by Public Works, Police and Administration. She noted that the City
386 will actually be reviewing frequently, and much earlier than a one-year check; especially in
387 coordinating with the police officers and how they are managing that traffic.
388 This is a constant matter with the schools and the Hamilton County sheriff.

389
390 Ms. Henao stated that it would still be fine for Planning Commission to have them come back
391 and report on how it is working, but Planning Commission does not have the authority to dictate
392 that another lane needed to be added.

393
394 ***Mr. Leibson made a motion to approve the application from SHP, on behalf of Sycamore***
395 ***Community Schools, for Final Development Site Plan modifications to the existing High***
396 ***School and construction of a new stadium at 7400 Cornell Road, contingent on the Staff***
397 ***Comments from the Staff Report dated January 14, 2022, "Expansion of Conditional Use and***
398 ***Final Development Plan Approval for Sycamore High School, 7400 Cornell Road", including***
399 ***the following condition:***

400 ***1) The impervious surface area shall not exceed 43%.***

401

Planning Commission Meeting

January 18, 2022

- 402 2) *The applicant shall comply with the specific conditions for a conditional use permit*
403 *listed in Section 151.2007(v) Schools, public and private.*
404
405 3) *Events that regularly exceed the on-site parking capability of 2,985 visitors shall*
406 *demonstrate that additional parking can be created on-site or through a shared*
407 *parking arrangement.*
408
409 4) *Should the future average attendance at events exceed 2,985 spectators per game for*
410 *an entire season, the School will establish a permanent plan for additional parking or a*
411 *shared parking arrangement.*
412
413 5) *Sycamore Schools shall not schedule large events in the Natatorium or Auditorium*
414 *during large events at the Stadium, which would cause the parking requirement to*
415 *exceed the capability of the site.*
416
417 6) *Addition of a sidewalk along the eastern driveway to provide pedestrian access to the*
418 *stadium.*
419
420 7) *Addition of a crosswalk on Cornell Road at Valleystream, if deemed appropriate by the*
421 *Traffic Engineer.*
422
423 8) *The height of the stadium lighting be a maximum height of 80 feet.*
424
425 9) *All bleachers, including the press box not exceed 45 feet and scoreboard to not exceed*
426 *35 feet.*
427
428 10) *The six-foot vinyl coated chain link security fence be permitted as proposed.*
429
430 11) *All parking lot lighting to not exceed a permitted a maximum height of 20 feet.*
431
432 12) *All stadium lighting shall be turned off a maximum of 1 hour after events.*
433
434 13) *Any evening events that end after 9 p.m. shall have cleanup activities occur the next*
435 *day during daylight hours.*
436
437 14) *New signage be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission prior to*
438 *installation.*
439 15) *A dedicated ambulance access point, dedicated parking spot, and a gate added to the*
440 *fence in the southeastern section of the stadium with a 12-foot drive to a pad next to*
441 *the playing field be added as approved by the Fire Department.*
442
443 16) *The location of fire hydrants shall be reviewed and approved by the Fire Chief.*
444

These minutes are a draft of the proposed minutes from the Planning Commission meeting. They do not represent the official record of proceedings until formally adopted by the Planning Commission. Formal adoption is noted by signature of the Chair, within the Minutes.

Planning Commission Meeting

January 18, 2022

445 *17) All new fire hydrants shall be Kennedy K-81A with a Storz outlet as required by the*
446 *Fire Department.*

447
448 *Mr. Dong seconded the motion.*

449
450 *The roll was called and showed the following vote:*

451
452 *AYE: Mr. Hirotsu, Mr. Leibson, Mr. Dong, Chairman Matre (4)*
453 *NAY: (0)*
454 *ABSENT: Ms. Steinebrey, Mr. Stull (2)*
455 *ABSTAINED: (0)*

456
457 *This motion is approved.*

458
459 *Chairman Matre called for a 10-minute break at 8:55pm.*
460 *The meeting re-convened at 9:05pm*

461
462 **New Business -3**
463 *An application for text amendments to Chapter 151.15 “Old Montgomery Gateway District*
464 *Regulations” and Chapter 151.30 “Sign Regulations” of the Land Usage Code.*

465
466 **Staff Report**
467 Ms. Henao reviewed the Staff Report dated January 13, 2022, “Proposed Text Amendments for
468 Chapter 151.30 Sign Code & chapter 151.15 Old Montgomery Gateway District”.

469
470 Mr. Dong asked if these text amendments were only for the Montgomery Quarter, or did they
471 apply to all of Montgomery. Ms. Henao stated the updates will be for the entire community.
472 They are not specific to Montgomery Quarter but will also apply to the area as a part of updates
473 pertaining to the Old Montgomery Gateway District. She summarized that the intent of the
474 updates are to correct and provide additional clarity of regulations as well as to revise the code to
475 permit signage that is consistent with scale and mass of buildings. The current code is designed
476 for signage on single and two-story buildings. The updated regulations reflect changes
477 appropriate for larger structures that may have multiple entrances and frontage on more than one
478 street which require more flexibility for effective identification and wayfinding. She indicated
479 the updates will appropriately modernize processes for larger scale developments that previously
480 required variances. She referred to the 2 packs included in the Commissioner’s packet: one that
481 showed the changes for overall district, and one that showed only for Old Montgomery Gateway.
482 She also noted that specific regulations for the Heritage District would still supersede these
483 regulations.

484
485 Ms. Henao showed on the wide screen, for all, various buildings and sign examples that related
486 to the examples she was explaining. She reviewed each one of the proposed text amendments
487 and pointed out which changes were for the entire city, and which ones were not.

488

These minutes are a draft of the proposed minutes from the Planning Commission meeting. They do not represent the official record of proceedings until formally adopted by the Planning Commission. Formal adoption is noted by signature of the Chair, within the Minutes.

Planning Commission Meeting

January 18, 2022

489 There was much discussion on Chapter 151.3014 regarding lighting, and the members were in
490 favor of these changes.

491
492 Mr. Dong asked if there were any changes to the electronic messaging signs. Ms. Henao stated
493 there were no changes made; that all remains the same as electronic messaging is prohibited.
494

495 Ms. Henao pointed out and corrected an error on the last line of page 4 of the Staff Report – it
496 should read that the PC makes a recommendation to City Council.

497
498 She pointed out that, from the enclosed November 10, 2021 Landmarks Commission minutes,
499 there was a considerable amount of discussion about lighting, color range and brightness levels
500 that resulted in additions to the current proposed regulations. She stated that the Landmarks
501 Commission ultimately voted to recommend approval of the text amendments. Commissioners
502 appreciated Landmarks time and concern.

503
504 Ms. Henao introduced Ms. Kolar.

505
506 **Kelly Kolar, President & Founder, Kolar Design, 807 Broadway, 5th Floor, Cincinnati, OH**
507 **45202** stated that it has been a pleasure to work with Staff and the consultants, as well as the
508 Landmarks Commission. She noted that the Landmarks Commission was very insightful and
509 helped make the code and text amendments better. She noted that she had created and refined
510 the diagrams, based on their input.

511
512 Ms. Kolar stated that she helped to revise the Code in Dublin, Ohio, with a similar process.
513 There were no questions from the Commission.

514
515 Mr. Hirotsu commented that this seemed that the exceptions could now be bundled into a rule,
516 for the common theme of larger buildings, mass and scale and size. He felt these changes would
517 save the Commission an immense amount of time in deliberations, with clear, concise guidelines.

518
519 ***Mr. Leibson made a motion that Planning Commission recommend to City Council that they***
520 ***approve the application for text amendments to Chapter 151.15 “Old Montgomery Gateway***
521 ***District Regulations” and Chapter 151.30 “Sign Regulations” of the Land Usage Code, as***
522 ***articulated in the Staff Report dated January 13, 2022, “Proposed Text Amendments for***
523 ***Chapter 151.30 Sign Code & Chapter 151.15 Old Montgomery Gateway District.”***

524
525 ***Mr. Dong seconded the motion.***

526
527 ***The roll was called and showed the following vote:***

528
529 ***AYE: Mr. Dong, Mr. Hirotsu, Mr. Leibson, Chairman Matre*** (4)

530 ***NAY:*** (0)

531 ***ABSENT: Ms. Steinebrey, Mr. Stull*** (2)

532 ***ABSTAINED:*** (0)

*These minutes are a draft of the proposed minutes from the Planning Commission meeting. They do not represent the official record of proceedings until formally adopted by the Planning Commission.
Formal adoption is noted by signature of the Chair, within the Minutes.*

Planning Commission Meeting

January 18, 2022

533

534 ***This motion is approved.***

535

536

DRAFT

These minutes are a draft of the proposed minutes from the Planning Commission meeting. They do not represent the official record of proceedings until formally adopted by the Planning Commission. Formal adoption is noted by signature of the Chair, within the Minutes.

Planning Commission Meeting

January 18, 2022

537 **Staff Report**

538 Mr. Chesar stated that, as of now, we will not have a Planning Commission meeting in February.
539 In March, we need to be prepared to vote on Chairman and Vice-Chairman, and we will also
540 discuss a possible change for the start time for these meetings, perhaps to 7:00 p.m.

541
542 Ms. Henao stated that we are moving forward on the roundabout design at Deerfield and Pfeiffer.
543 As part of that, the white house that sits on the church property, that is owned by the church –
544 will be demolished because of the roundabout.

545
546 Ms. Henao stated that you may have seen National Guard presence in Weller Park. This is due
547 to them helping Tri-Health and Bethesda North with a mobile COVID testing site.

548
549 Mr. Hirotsu asked about the possibility of virtual meetings, for the future. Mr. Chesar stated that
550 the state law permitting such had expired in July of 2021. Ms. Henao stated that there has been
551 conversation at the state level about potentially changing the law and giving localities the
552 authority to make that decision; but it has not been changed yet. As of now, the City is required
553 to hold in-person meetings.

554
555 **Council Report**

556 Ms. Bismeyer felt that Staff had covered the topics well.

557
558 **Minutes**

559 Mr. Hirotsu moved to approve the minutes of December 20, 2022, as submitted.
560 Mr. Leibson seconded the motion. The Commission unanimously approved the minutes.

561
562 **Adjournment**

563 Mr. Leibson moved to adjourn. Mr. Hirotsu seconded the motion.
564 The Commission unanimously approved. The meeting adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

565
566
567
568
569
570

571 Karen Bouldin, Clerk	571 Jim Matre, Chairman	571 Date
--------------------------	-------------------------	----------

572 /ksb
573