



Planning Commission
January 21, 2025 - 6:00 PM
233 South Main Street, Monroe, Ohio

Call to Order

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes

- Planning Commission minutes for the November 19, 2024 meeting

Old Business

New Business

Administrative Reports

Adjournment



**Planning Commission Minutes
November 19, 2024
233 South Main Street, Monroe, Ohio**

Call to Order

Mr. Frye called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Roll Call

Planning Commission members present: Christina McElfresh, Andrew Hall, Robert Duckworth, Matthew Frye, and Debbie Hagedorn

Staff members present: Tom Smith, Development Director; Kameryn Jones, Assistant Development Director; Jameson Cole, Planner; Michelle Layman, Planning and Zoning Specialist

Approval of the Minutes

Mrs. Hagedorn moved to approve the minutes from the October 15, 2024, meeting; seconded by Mr. Duckworth. Voice vote. Motion carried.

Old Business

Mr. Frye requested a motion to remove Case No. 2024-10-6 Consideration of a site plan and conditional use permit for the expansion of Monroe First Church of God from the table. Mrs. McElfresh made the motion. Seconded by Mrs. Hagedorn. Voice vote. Motion carried.

Mr. Cole reviewed the proposed expansion. Mr. Cole stated the applicant has submitted an updated site plan that shows the parking islands were added and the sidewalk is located behind the current trees.

Mr. Cole stated the landscaping plan needs to be met and they are currently missing 7 street trees.

Mr. Cole asked for clarification of the lighting. Mrs. McElfresh stated they do not want bright lighting on the side near residents.

Mrs. Jones stated the their will be wall pack lighting. She also stated staff can work with the applicant to increase lighting in the parking area for safety purposes or the lighting



can be left as is. She also stated the new portion of the site will meet the lighting requirements.

Mr. Cole reviewed the information previously discussed at the hearing.

Mr. Cole reviewed department comments as follows:

Fire: Fire reserves the right for further review with formal building permit submittal.

Police: No comment.

Engineering/Public Works Department: engineering review is ongoing and should be finished up soon.

Mr. Cole reviewed staff recommendations as follows:

- Staff recommends approval of the Conditional Use and Site Plan applications with the following conditions:
- Clarification on the direction regarding minimum lighting requirements.
- The landscape plan be revised to address staff report comments.
- All landscaping must meet all minimum species and size requirements and be detailed appropriately on the plan.
- All ground-mounted and rooftop equipment must be appropriately screened as approved by Staff.
- All Engineering review comments be addressed.
- The applicant will be responsible for maintenance (mowing, etc.) of the right-of-way adjacent to the developed site once improvements are complete.
- Digital files of final plans compatible with City GIS be submitted.
- All other Staff comments be met.

Mr. Duckworth asked for clarification of the lighting proposal. Mrs. Jones stated the new addition and parking areas meet the lighting standards. The old section does not meet current standards. The church has been functioning with the lighting they have.

Ray Macintosh spoke for the church. He clarified the lighting that is already in place at the church. He stated they haven't had any safety issues with the current lighting.

Mrs. Hagedorn moved to approve Case No. 2024-10-6- Consideration of a site plan and conditional use permit for the expansion of Monroe First Church of God with the following conditions:

- Clarification on the direction regarding minimum lighting requirements
- The landscaping plan be revised to address staff report comments
- All landscaping must meet all minimum species and size requirements and be detailed appropriately on the plan
- All ground-mounted and rooftop equipment must be appropriately screened as approved by staff



- All engineering review comments be addressed
- The applicant will be responsible for maintenance (mowing, etc) of the right of way adjacent to the developed site once improvements are complete
- Digital files of final plans compatible with city GIS be submitted
- All other staff comments be met.

Seconded by Mr. Hall. Roll call vote. 5 ayes. Motion carried.

New Business

Mr. Frye opened the public hearing for Case No. 2024-11-8- Consideration of a PUD Amendment to the Hyde Park at the Crossings Planned Unit Development.

Mr. Frye stated The request will be presented by Staff. Following this presentation, anyone wishing to speak in favor of the proposal will be given an opportunity to speak. After all proponents have spoken, the opponents will be given an opportunity to present their case. Speakers are asked not to repeat the same ideas which have been previously presented but indicate that they agree with a previous speaker. All persons speaking are subject to cross examination and must be sworn. Planning Commission has the opportunity to question any speaker after they have completed their presentation. Once the public hearing is closed, individual speakers have no right to comment during discussion by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Frye asked that all those wishing to speak during this public hearing (including staff) to stand and raise their right hand to be sworn in.

Having been sworn in Mrs. Jones presented the background as follows:

- NVR, Inc. has submitted an application for PUD Amendment regarding the Hyde Park at the Crossings Planned Unit Development.
- Hyde Park at the Crossings, now presented as Townes at Monroe Crossings, is a proposed residential development located at Crossings Boulevard and Roden Park Drive.
- The site contains two parcels, approximately 21 acres total, currently zoned GR General Residential PUD.
- The applicant seeks to revise the previously approved PUD Plan and PUD agreement, which was passed by Council in January 2023. Broadly speaking, the applicant proposes the following:
 - 84 single-family attached units ranging from 2-unit structures to 4-unit structures.
 - All housing would be developed on the south side of Roden Park Drive with the north side utilized as recreational open space to include a dog park (4 FT tall black chain link fence surround), gazebo structure, fire pit, and open lawn space.
 - 10 FT shared use path to extend the full length of Roden Park Drive.



Mrs. Jones reviewed the zoning map of the proposed site and surrounding properties.

Mrs. Jones reviewed staff comments as follows:

- Because the proposed plan contains significant differences from that of the approved Hyde Park at the Crossings plan, the applicant must restart the application process, requiring a recommendation from Planning Commission and approval from City Council. The primary changes proposed by the applicant are summarized below:

- Site Plan:

- Increase of total units from 83 to 84.

This change only slightly increases the development density from 3.97 to 4.017 acres.

- Minimum lot width reduction from 30 FT to 24 FT.

- Removal of housing and infrastructure on the north side of Roden Park Drive.

The previously approved plan included 22 units, associated City street improvements, and amenity space on this side of the property.

- Open Space:

- Amenity space moved to the north side of Roden Park Drive, including the addition of a dog park.

The previously approved plan included three smaller amenity spaces, including two with pavilions, walkways, and benches.

Staff has previously suggested upgrading the fence material type for the dog park to a decorative black aluminum instead of chain link. The applicant has offered a KY board fence as an alternate.

- Extend shared use path from a stopping point on Roden Park Drive to the intersection at Cold Water Drive.

The previous agreement required a shared use path that extended short of the creek along Roden Park Drive. The specific design of the path, particularly regarding the method of crossing Cold Water Creek, will be part of the subdivision and construction drawing review process.

- Architectural:

- Addition of fiber cement siding to the permitted exterior building materials. The renderings submitted show stone along the base of the front façade of the first floor and full fiber cement siding on the front, side, and rear of the first and second floors.

As written in the approved agreement, only brick, stone, cultured stone, and stucco are allowed as primary materials.

Staff does not oppose the incorporation of fiber cement siding but recommends the inclusion of some stone to the side and rear elevations.

- Elimination of bay windows as a design element option.

As written in the approved agreement, bay windows are listed as one of several design feature options required on the front façade and front and side facades for homes near street corners.

Staff does not necessarily oppose the elimination of the option, though it leaves the applicant with fewer elements to choose from.

Mrs. Jones reviewed department comments as follows:

- Fire Department: Concern regarding the proposed fire pit. Fire reserves the right to comment during future plan reviews.
 - The applicant has indicated the wood burning fire pit is intended to be used similarly to a charcoal grill or a campsite fire and will not have a gas line. A water spicket will be provided for access to water and the pit would be surrounded by pavement or gravel. The applicant has indicated they are willing to install a grate with a lock.
- Police Department: No comment.
- Engineering/Public Works Department: Engineering review is ongoing and will continue through future review processes.

Mrs. Jones stated as of 11/15/24, no comment has been received from the public regarding this application.

Mrs. Jones reviewed the staff recommendation as follows:

- Staff recommends Planning Commission give a favorable recommendation to City Council to approve the requested PUD amendment with the following conditions:
 - Discussion and decision regarding the proposed dog park fencing material.
 - Discussion and decision regarding the proposed elevations regarding exterior material types and design elements.



Mrs. McElfresh asked what is acceptable for the proposed fencing. Mrs. Jones stated chain link isn't an approved material for some residential areas but because this is a dog park it isn't well defined.

Mrs. McElfresh asked what the difference is between hardy plank and other cement materials. Mr. Hall stated hardy plank is just the brand name but it is the same type of material.

Mrs. McElfresh asked if there will be a playground installed. Mrs. Jones stated there is not a playground but there is other gathering space/open space. There is also a pavilion. Mrs. McElfresh stated her concern is that it is safe to cross the street. She asked if there would be a sidewalk in place. Mrs. Jones stated the existing 8 ft path on Crossings Blvd that will remain. There is also a 10-foot path going up Roden Park that will remain. Mrs. Jones also stated there is a place showing on the plans where a crossing will be, which is near the dog park.

Mr. Frye asked if the roads would be public or private. Mrs. Jones stated they will be public roads.

Mr. Hall asked if the open space would be maintained by the City. Mrs. Jones stated it would be maintained by their HOA.

Mr. Hall asked how much space there is behind the properties where it appears to be a shared back yard area. Mrs. Jones stated she will defer that question to the applicant.

Mr. Duckworth asked if the HOA is the same one as is in place for Monroe Crossings. Mrs. Jones stated it is not.

Alex Betsch with Bayer Becker spoke for the applicant.

Mr. Hall asked how much space there is behind the properties. Mr. Betsch stated he is unsure of acreage but can get that information. Mr. Hall asked if it would be one large area. Mr. Betsch stated it will be. Mr. Hall asked if there are any privacy fences between properties. Mr. Betsch stated there are not. Mr. Hall asked if there would be any patios. Mr. Betsch stated there will be.

Shawn Bullock with NVR spoke. He stated there will be privacy fences at the individual unit edges to block off from next-door properties.

Mrs. McElfresh asked what the green space was showing on the plans. Mr. Bullock stated it is an open green space. He stated they are not proposing a playground in that area.



Mr. Bullock explained the difference in the two home styles.

Mr. Frye asked how many of each home type there will be. Mr. Betsch stated there are 58 Thornwood units and 26 Caroline units.

Mr. Frye asked if due to the elimination of the bay window in the front would that change the minimum window percentage requirement. Mrs. Jones stated there is no minimum but that they will need to incorporate three of the seven design elements. She stated the design elements vary in several ways.

Mr. Duckworth asked if their design layout has fewer trees as there are fewer details in their plans. Mrs. Jones stated there is more decorative low-level landscaping on the old plans but that it wasn't required at the time. Mrs. Jones stated they are required to buffer near Bayberry and Kohler. Mr. Betsch stated the trees were moved from outside of the right of way to inside of it to create a tree canopy.

Mr. Duckworth asked if their will signage showing the name of the community. Mr. Bullock stated there will be signs at both entrances.

Mr. Frye asked for any opponents that wanted to speak.

Lori Holthaus spoke regarding her mother's property on Bayberry. Mrs. Holthaus stated because they have a wider lot they have a lot of kids who cross by their property. She referenced the previous landscaping plans. She also asked if there would be a fence put up. Mrs. Holthaus stated that with the proposed dog park there will now be a black chain link fence which is not part of Monroe Crossings HOA guidelines. Mrs. Holthaus also stated she believed that because there isn't a park in the plans that residents would be using Monroe Crossings amenities. Mrs. Holthaus also asked if there would be any guest parking on Roden Park Drive. Mrs. McElfresh stated their doesn't appear to be any guest parking aside from on street parking.

Mrs. McElfresh asked if the roads in the Heritage Green subdivision are public or private. Mr. Smith stated they are private. Mrs. McElfresh went on to say it appears the roads in the new development will be wider to allow for on street parking.

Mr. Betsch pointed out where the landscaping would be.

Mrs. McElfresh asked the applicant if someone is visiting the dog park with accessibility issues is there parking. The applicant stated there is not.

Mrs. Holthaus went on to explain the complexity of her property.



Mrs. Jones presented the documents for the record which were the application, the relevant code sections, proof of publication, the legal ad for the paper, and the staff report.

Mr. Hall moved to accept the documents submitted for the record. Seconded by Mr. Duckworth. Voice vote. Motion carried.

Mr. Duckworth moved to close the public hearing. Seconded by Mrs. Hagedorn. Voice vote. Motion carried.

Mrs. McElfresh stated to keep in mind this is the elevated view of the project. She asked if this case will come back for design. Mrs. Jones stated this hearing is to only address the PUD agreement and PUD plan. It will address any changes outside of what the code permits. After this they would proceed with the regular subdivision process which is a preliminary plat, construction drawings, possible phasing, and final plat.

Mr. Frye asked if there is buffering between the open space and the neighborhood next to the space. Mrs. Jones stated there is.

Mrs. McElfresh asked what everyone felt about the fencing material. Regarding the dog park chain link she feels a metal fence will hold up longer than a wooden one.

Mrs. Hagedorn believes the chain link is the better option.

Planning Commission discussed the fencing, lack of playground, HOA responsibilities, and landscaping.

Mrs. McElfresh discussed the use of vinyl siding and that she believes going with a cement board material is a good compromise.

Mr. Frye asked if in the previous plans there is any language in the PUD agreement regarding the percentages of materials was required. Mrs. Jones stated the only change to materials being asked for by the applicant is the use of the cement board.

Mr. Hall voiced that he doesn't like the use of chain link fencing for the dog park. Mrs. McElfresh stated she thinks the fencing can be concealed with landscaping.

Mr. Bullock said they are willing to create a buffer with landscaping to help conceal the chain link fencing.

Mrs. McElfresh asked what the next option up from chain link is. The applicant stated it is aluminum, but the cost is too high.



Mrs. McElfresh also asked if the property that abuts the neighboring communities' backyards has a berm or landscaping to help keep them private.

Mrs. Hagedorn moved to recommend approval to City Council Case No. 2024-11-8—Consideration of a PUD Amendment to the Hyde Park at the Crossings Planned Unit Development with the following conditions:

- Black chain link fence with landscaping to help cover the chain link.
- Agree with proposed exterior material types and design elements
- All other staff comments be met.

Seconded by Mr. Duckworth. Roll call vote. 4 ayes, 1 no. Motion carried.

Mr. Frye opened the public hearing for Case No. 2024-11-9-Consideration of Amendments to various sections of the Planning and Zoning Code.

Mr. Frye stated The request will be presented by Staff. Following this presentation, anyone wishing to speak in favor of the proposal will be given an opportunity to speak. After all proponents have spoken, the opponents will be given an opportunity to present their case. Speakers are asked not to repeat the same ideas which have been previously presented but indicate that they agree with a previous speaker. All persons speaking are subject to cross examination and must be sworn. Planning Commission has the opportunity to question any speaker after they have completed their presentation. Once the public hearing is closed, individual speakers have no right to comment during discussion by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Frye asked that all those wishing to speak during this public hearing (including staff) to stand and raise their right hand to be sworn in.

Mrs. Jones presented the background as follows:

- The Development Department has submitted a list of amendments to various sections of the Planning and Zoning Code.
- The City adopted a new Planning and Zoning Code in April this year at the end of a comprehensive update process.
- As staff has implemented the code, we have been keeping track of minor errors, inconsistencies, and other minor changes to be refined in a future update.
- It is the intent that minor updates such as these will be performed annually to address needed changes.

Mrs. Jones reviewed staff comments as follows:

- Planning Commission considers the relevant review criteria found in Table 1207.07-1 and 1207.22 of the Planning and Zoning Code:



- The request complies with the applicable standards of the Monroe Code of Ordinances, and any applicable county, state, or federal requirements.

The request and process comply with the applicable standards listed above.

- The development review body has considered the recommendation of the City staff.

Planning Commission will utilize the recommendation outlined in this report in their recommendation.

- The request is consistent with applicable policies of the Comprehensive Plan, utility plans, and capital improvement plans or if it addresses a topic that is not contained or not fully developed in the Comprehensive Plan, the request does not impair the implementation of the Comprehensive Plan.

The amendments are minor in nature and do not conflict with the previously approved code, which was established to implement the Comprehensive Plan.

- The request promotes the purposes of this PZC as established in 1201.02, Purposes, and in other applicable purpose statements in this PZC.

The request promotes the purpose of the Planning and Zoning Code. In particular, this submission of code amendments addresses 1201.02(F) Clear Regulations and Processes to ensure our code continues to be consistent and straightforward for the end user.

- Changing Condition. The amendment is necessary to address a changing condition that was not anticipated in the Comprehensive Plan or this PZC; and

The nature of these drafted amendments are minor corrections and not intended to address any changed conditions.

- Impact Mitigation. The proposal helps to mitigate adverse impacts of the use and development of land on the natural or built environments, including, but not limited to, mobility, air quality, water quality, noise levels, stormwater management, and vegetation, or will be neutral with respect to these issues;

The nature of these drafted amendments are minor corrections and will be neutral with respect to these issues.



- Community Need. Whether the proposed amendment addresses a demonstrated community need;

The nature of these drafted amendments are minor corrections.

- Strategic Objectives. The proposal advances the strategic objectives of the City Council, such as fiscal responsibility, efficient use of infrastructure and public services, and other articulated City objectives.

These amendments are intended to make the code more efficient for staff and the public.

- No Single Factor and Case Determination. No single factor listed above may control and not all factors may be applicable in each case. Each case shall be determined on its own facts.

Mrs. Jones reviewed department comments as follows:

- No department comment submitted

Mrs. Jones reviewed the staff recommendation as follows:

- Staff recommends that Planning Commission forward a recommendation to City Council that they amend the Planning and Zoning Code with the proposed amendments as included in this report.

Mrs. McElfresh moved to accept the documents for the record. Seconded by Mrs. Hagedorn. Voice vote. Motion carried.

Mrs. McElfresh moved to close the public hearing. Seconded by Mr. Duckworth. Voice vote. Motion carried.

Mrs. Hagedorn moved to recommend approval to City Council that they amend the City of Monroe Planning and Zoning Code of Ordinances with the proposed amendments as included in this report.

Seconded by Mr. Hall. Roll call vote. 5 ayes. Motion carried.

Adjournment

Mr. Hall moved to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Mr. Duckworth. Voice vote. Motion carried.



The Planning Commission meeting adjourned at 7:34 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle Layman
Planning and Zoning Specialist