

May 8, 2017

Mr. Roger Friedmann – Chairman
Mr. Rich Barrick – Vice-Chairman
Mr. Tom Kronenberger – Member
Ms. Anne Flanagan – Member
Mr. Bill Mees – Secretary
Mr. Steve Roos – Alternate

Item 1. – Meeting called to Order

Mr. Friedmann called the regular meeting of the Zoning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, May 8, 2017.

Item 2. – Roll Call of the Board

Mr. Mees called the roll.

Members Present: Ms. Flanagan, Mr. Barrick, Mr. Friedmann, Mr. Kronenberger and Mr. Mees

Members Absent: Mr. Roos

Staff Present: Harry Holbert and Beth Gunderson

Item 3. – Approval of Minutes

Mr. Friedmann stated the first order of business was to approve the March 13, 2017 meeting minutes.

Mr. Friedmann asked for any corrections to the March 13, 2017 minutes.

Mr. Friedmann entertained a motion to approve the March 13, 2017 meeting minutes.

Ms. Flanagan moved to approve the March 13, 2017 meeting minutes.

Mr. Barrick seconded.

All Voted: Yes.

Item 4. – Old Business

2017-06MA
Kenwood Crossing II, LLC
4580 E. Galbraith Road
Major Adjustment to a PUD

Mr. Friedmann noted the case had originally been heard by the Zoning Commission in March.

Mr. Holbert presented the case and case history in a Power Point presentation. He noted the applicant had submitted a new site plan. Mr. Holbert pointed out the frontage along Monroe Avenue and an aerial view of the surrounding zoning districts. Mr. Holbert then reviewed the locations of the existing signs for Kenwood Crossings. The proposed sign would be the fifth sign. Mr. Holbert showed photos of each sign.

Mr. Holbert said the applicant provided a survey showing the proposed location as 17 feet from Pine Road and ten feet from Galbraith Road and noted location of the sign easement. Mr. Holbert

showed the existing conditions including the existing streetscape buffer. Mr. Holbert said the applicant intends to remove some of the streetscape buffer which was a requirement for the Arden Courts property per the condition noted in case 2004-06MA. He said one tree and five shrubs would be removed from the streetscape to install the sign.

Mr. Holbert reminded the Board the proposed sign would be 70 square feet and would be located in a residential district which, as of right, may have a maximum 32 square feet sign.

Mr. Holbert concluded his presentation by stating the three things the Board should keep in mind are the applicant is requesting an off premise advertising monument sign, the property is permitted one 32 square feet sign and the proposal adds a second, 70 square feet sign, and the proposal includes removing some of the required streetscape buffer.

The Board asked questions of Mr. Holbert.

Ms. Flanagan asked if Mr. Holbert could show the view of the existing Kenwood Crossing Development sign from the street.

Mr. Holbert said because the network was down he could not bring CAGIS up to show the street view.

Mr. Barrick asked how large the Arden Courts sign is.

Mr. Holbert said its dimensions are five feet eight inches by six feet.

Mr. Mees asked how tall the existing Kenwood Crossing development sign is.

Mr. Holbert said it matches the dimensions of the proposed sign and showed those on the slide.

Mr. Friedmann asked the address for Kenwood Crossing.

Mr. Holbert said there is confusion, the legal address is 8250 Pine Road for Kenwood Crossing One but they do use Kenwood Crossing Way as a street name sometimes.

Mr. Friedmann asked if the applicant was present and wished to speak.

Mr. Mike Cassidy, with Atlantic Sign Company, of 2328 Florence Ave., Cincinnati, OH 45206, addressed the Board. Mr. Cassidy noted there was question at the previous meeting in March about property line versus right of way. He said the new submittal clarifies this and shows the sign ten feet back from the right of way. He said the original design had six tenant listings, while the new submittal has four tenant panels. Mr. Cassidy said the reason the tenant panels are proposed is that Kenwood Crossing III will sit fairly far back on Pine Road and people interested in leasing in that building want to know how they can get exposure on Galbraith Road. He said the bottom line is the sign is necessary on Galbraith Road to promote Kenwood Crossing III and its major tenants so that people can find the location. The sign will help people make the turn into Pine Road and know that they are going the right way for Kenwood Crossing III.

Mr. Cassidy said Arden Courts is zoned residential but in all reality is a piece of commercial property. He pointed out it is not an apartment complex, it is a business and they are promoting their facility with their sign. He said there is residential across the street but there are more professional developments surrounding the property.

Mr. Cassidy said the proposal does include removing bushes and a tree, however, a landscape plan to maintain that buffer was submitted which Mr. Holbert didn't note in his presentation.

Mr. Cassidy said if the board is more inclined to approve the sign without the tenant panels, they are willing to make that concession. The applicant would rather not give that up but if it helps to get the sign approved they are willing to do so.

Mr. Mees asked if the sign that is proposed would say Kenwood Crossing III on it.

Mr. Cassidy answered that had not yet been decided.

Mr. Mees asked Mr. Holbert if the code distinguishes between a development sign and one that lists tenants.

Mr. Holbert said the code allows for a development sign in a residential district to identify a subdivision development. He listed some examples. He said in this case, a sign is being proposed in a residential district to promote a commercial development behind it. Mr. Holbert then explained the difference between a monument sign with tenant panels, which is specific for the tenants located in a building, and a development sign, which is for an entire development and may include multiple buildings and tenants.

Mr. Holbert said he finds the applicant's statements confusing because Mr. Cassidy said the intent for the proposal is for the tenants to have exposure on Galbriath Road, but then said the applicant would accept the sign without the tenant panels. Mr. Holbert said a development sign that says Kenwood Crossing already exists at Kenwood Crossing I.

Mr. Cassidy said they would really like to keep the four tenant panels but, if all they can get is a sign for Kenwood Crossing III, they are willing to accept that.

Mr. Friedmann noted there are no tenants yet for Kenwood Crossing III, so it is unknown how many tenants there will be. He said it could be just one tenant.

There was discussion about what would happen with the tenant panels if there were fewer than four tenants.

Mr. Friedmann stated he understands that Neyer Properties had sold Kenwood Crossing I and therefore has no control over that sign.

Mr. Friedmann asked for clarification on the address of Kenwood Crossing III.

Mr. Mees asked about the address also.

Mr. Jeff Chamot, with Neyer Properties, 2135 Dana Ave., Cincinnati, OH 45207, addressed the Board. He said originally Pine Road was a paper street and did not extend very far down that direction. At that time there was a small drive called Kenwood Crossing Way. Later, Pine Road was extended so now the buildings all officially have Pine Road addresses.

Mr. Kronenberger stated no one will know what Kenwood Crossing III is without an address, noting the address will be Pine Road. Ultimately, people will have to find Pine Road to get to this destination.

The applicants answered that is correct.

Mr. Barrick said he understands that the applicants are trying to come up with way finding for all these tenants but said he doesn't think this proposal will help with that. He said there is a bigger issue here and he is not sure if this is solving anything.

Mr. Cassidy said he understands Mr. Barrick's point but even those using GPS will drive by it without a sign. The Kenwood Crossing III will be a way finding sign which will help clarify.

Mr. Barrick said there is a letter that the applicant submitted as evidence from a tenant in Kenwood Crossing II. He pointed out the plan as submitted will not help that tenant.

Mr. Cassidy said he can't make the sign any bigger to include Kenwood Crossing II.

Mr. Barrick suggested a "Kenwood Crossing West" or some designation in which buildings II and III could be together.

Mr. Friedmann agreed with Mr. Barrick's point that businesses there are not using Kenwood Crossing as their address, they are using Pine Road.

Mr. Mees asked if it was important for the tenants to have a presence on Galbraith Road or if it would be better to have Kenwood Crossing on Galbraith then, once drivers turn in on Pine Road, they could look to directory signs to know which tenants are in which building.

Mr. Cassidy said the applicant originally wanted to get exposure for major tenants on Galbraith Road, but if the Board will not allow that, the applicant will settle for a way finding sign for Kenwood Crossing III. He noted the applicant cannot change the Kenwood Crossing I sign because they no longer own that property.

Ms. Flanagan asked if it would be possible to approach the owners of Kenwood Crossing I about sign rebranding, saying it seems like if the applicant can work with Arden Courts it may be possible to work with them.

Mr. Chamot said has talked to the new owner and was unsuccessful.

Ms. Flanagan asked what the applicant suggested to the new owner.

Mr. Chamot said they asked about the possibility of modifying the sign, and perhaps adding tenants to it, but the new owner was not interested.

Mr. Chamot said they do have at least one prospect that they've been working with for Kenwood Crossing III. Lucke has shown interest in building office condos there. Mr. Chamot said they may call it "The Office Condos at Kenwood Crossing" or something like that. He noted it would be important for Lucke to have some identification on Galbraith Road

Mr. Friedmann noted Lucke has other office condos in another location in Sycamore Township at Cornell and Snider with no street sign on the main road.

Mr. Chamot said that could be but this would give them some competitive advantage and help them sell the condos.

Mr. Friedmann closed the floor to comments and the Board discussed the issues brought before them.

Ms. Flanagan made a motion to consider Case 2017-06MA.

Mr. Mees seconded.

Mr. Mees said the application has improved since it was last submitted. He said he is not particularly troubled by a second sign on the property because he agrees that Arden Courts is not residential in the traditional way. He said if the intent is to create the place of Kenwood Crossing as a wayfinding, he understands that, and he assumes it wouldn't be difficult to replace the landscaping.

Ms. Flanagan said she doesn't see a need for a second sign. She said if the sign is just identifying Kenwood Crossing, it would be up to the businesses to have directional signs further back. She noted that, even though Arden Courts is not typical residential, it is transitional because there are residential areas close by.

Mr. Kronenberger said there are many places in the Township where there are offices a block or so off a main thoroughfare and the code is written to prevent off site advertising to promote businesses half a block off the main road. He said any type of tenant panel on the sign there is against the spirit and intent of the sign code.

Mr. Barrick said he understands the desire to promote tenants but thinks the confusion with the Pine Road address is the bigger issue. He suggested putting the Pine Road address on the signs.

Mr. Friedmann asked if there is a street sign that says Pine Road.

Mr. Holbert cautioned the Board saying they are not permitted to regulate sign content. If the Board said the panels had to be an address and not a tenant panel that could lead to litigation. He pointed out the applicant could come in with a face change application. Mr. Holbert said staff approves sign face changes as of right every day. He stated it is a questionable area to say that the sign has to display an address.

Mr. Friedmann said he understands the desire to have the sign there, but thinks instead of identification for tenants who may or may not be there in the future, it should be more for wayfinding. He said it could be a little bit smaller and that he thinks it is premature to be requesting exposure for future tenants. Mr. Friedmann said he is not sure a tenant would decide not to locate there because of the lack of a sign on Galbraith Road.

Mr. Mees called roll.

Ms. Flanagan – NEA

Mr. Barrick – AYE

Mr. Friedmann - NEA

Mr. Kronenberger – NEA

Mr. Mees - AYE

Mr. Friedmann said the case will be heard by the Board of Trustees in June at a date and time to be determined.

Item 5. – Trustees Report

Mr. Holbert reported on the status of the updated Sycamore Township Zoning Resolution. He stated staff had just received a first draft and sent back comments and that the hope is to have it to the

