

Meeting Minutes
Sycamore Township Zoning Commission
Township Administration Building
8540 Kenwood Road
Thursday, January 9, 2025
6:00 p.m.

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

Item 1. – Meeting called to Order

Mr. Friedmann called the Zoning Commission meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. on Thursday, January 9, 2025.

Item 2. – Roll Call of the Board

Mr. Mees called the roll.

Members Present: Ms. Flanagan, Mr. Friedmann, Mr. Mees, Mr. Barrick, Mr. Roos, Mr. Swanson

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Jeff Uckotter, Kevin Clark, Jon Ragan

Item 3. – Approval of December 9, 2025, Meeting Minutes

Mr. Friedmann asked if there was a motion to approve the December 9, 2024, meeting minutes.

Mr. Barrick made a motion to approve the December 9, 2024, minutes.

Mr. Mees seconded the motion.

All in favor, none opposed.

Item 4. – Old Business – Continued from December 9, 2024

Case: 2024-07P2

Applicant: Daniel R. Brooks (for Enterprise)

Location: 3912 E. Galbraith Road

Request: PUD II

Mr. Uckotter presented case 2024-07P2.

Proposal: Mr. Uckotter stated that the applicant seeks a PUD II to construct a western endcap (3912 E. Galbraith Rd) for Enterprise Car Rental use. Mr. Uckotter noted that there is not currently a PUD overlay on site. He presented table 3-2 from the zoning resolution referencing the intensity (ISR over .65), showing Automobile and Truck Rentals are specifically listed. Mr. Uckotter stated that in this case, staff found that because the proposed inventory (rental vehicles) would be parked outside, it signifies higher intensity use.

Mr. Uckotter presented an aerial view of the property (Dillonvale Shopping Center), noting that the PUD ensures parking is sufficient for the entire site. Mr. Uckotter stated that Enterprise proposes twenty-four (24) parking spaces, a new enclosed washing bay, and an interior finish/renovation. Mr. Uckotter presented proposed renderings showing masonry materials for the enclosed wash bay and stated that the bay would not be for public use. The landscape plan proposed by the applicant was shown.

Mr. Uckotter stated that the existing parking count is 732 spaces. He noted that without Enterprise, the site requires 688 parking spaces, and with Enterprise, 724 parking spaces. Mr. Uckotter spoke on Enterprise's proposed parking location, shown as boxes A and B on the aerial.

Mr. Uckotter reviewed STZR 18-7 General Standards for PUD Plan Approval.

Mr. Uckotter presented an alternative site arrangement proposed by staff. Mr. Uckotter noted that the alternate site arrangement includes designated parking spaces for Enterprise - south of the main building, an interior washing bay facing Wexford Av or the north elevation, and an 18' landscape buffer with the removal of the old teller station.

Staff Recommendation: Mr. Uckotter stated that staff recommends denial of the applicant's PUD II proposal as it further intensifies the already high ISR site. In turn, staff recommends approval of the staff PUD II proposal with the following conditions:

1. The wash bay shall be moved inside the building with a solid garage door facing Wexford Avenue. The wash bay shall not cause any noise to be heard from the Wexford Avenue property line and shall adhere to all EPA and Hamilton County drainage and environmental standards. Proof of adherence to these standards shall be incorporated into the Approved Zoning Compliance Plan.

2. At 56' wide, to the west of the building, a large sea of asphalt shall be reduced by implementing an 18'x117' concrete curbed landscape bed as seen in the plan – the landscape bed shall meet the F14A 15' ex. of 5 Street Trees and 12 Shrubs); all street trees shall be sited at least nine feet away from the sidewalk. The defunct bank teller station and associated bollards shall be removed and replaced with new asphalt; a revised western elevation shall be provided. The remaining 38' of asphalt shall be restriped and arrowed to allow for two-way internal site ingress and egress vehicular movements.

3. No Enterprise vehicle shall be queued/ parked to the side or the rear of the building. No Enterprise vehicle shall use Wexford Avenue to utilize the car wash and must use the internal two-way lanes as proposed to the west of the building.
4. Enterprise Rental Vehicles shall be restricted to the 24 parking spaces noted below and shall be marked with a 6-foot-tall, 2'x2' reflective sign reading "Enterprise Vehicle Only" in a Sans Serif Font, with no logos.
5. The remainder of the proposed PUD-2 (e.g., all other areas not affiliated with the Enterprise use) shall remain unchanged and shall reflect the existing conditions as seen in the application.
6. All landscaping shall be maintained in healthy condition and shall be replaced if the landscaping dies or is in unhealthy condition.
7. Enterprise acknowledges that if the 24-vehicle limit is eclipsed, the car rental use would be at risk of the zoning certificate being revoked or potential legal action.
8. This approval solely applies to the Enterprise Rental Company use only – any other car rental users seeking to use this space in the event of an Enterprise exit shall apply for a major revision to this PUD to ensure compliance with this PUD-2.
9. Although Enterprise does not propose a dumpster, if Enterprise sought a dumpster in the future, a masonry dumpster enclosure is required – consistent with the Zoning Resolution.

Mr. Uckotter added an additional condition:

10. Please provide the present parking schematic; this is the plan that was conceived after the library improvements.

Discussion: Ms. Flanagan asked Mr. Uckotter about the staff proposed relocation of the wash bay and whether it was due to aesthetics. Mr. Uckotter stated that the relocation is based on the intensity of use.

Mr. Roos asked Mr. Uckotter if the owners of Dillonvale Shopping Center had an opinion on the location of the wash bay. Mr. Uckotter stated that the Shopping Center owners (Paran) voiced concern over having vehicles inside the building.

Mr. Barrick mentioned the niche in the northwest corner, asking if the wash bay could be located there. Mr. Barrick stated that perhaps there should be a condition asking for the wash bay plans showing a firewall proposed.

Mr. Swanson asked Mr. Uckotter about the staff proposed six (6) parking spots for Enterprise shown on the site plan (south of the main building). Mr. Uckotter stated that the location of those six (6) spots was out of consideration to the neighboring businesses to the east of the subject property. There was a discussion between Mr. Swanson and Mr. Uckotter on logos and signage.

Mr. Mees noted that the twenty-four (24) required parking spaces were for rental cars. He asked if the remaining twelve (12) spaces (staff parking) would be located within the site's general parking lot. Mr. Uckotter stated, "Yes, that is correct."

Mr. Friedmann asked if the applicant would introduce themselves.

Dan Brooks (1517 Oak Knoll Dr. Cincinnati, OH 45224) introduced himself as the architect of the Enterprise proposal and stated that he would like to introduce Jennifer. Jennifer Hendrick with the Enterprise Property Department introduced herself from the podium. Ms. Hendrick noted that the property's location is perfect for their needs. Mr. Brooks presented the proposed washing bay locations and showed the turning radiuses of the vehicles at each location. Mr. Brooks stated that if the wash bay were located in the rear of the existing building, it would cost a large amount of money due to moving the mechanicals and old bank vault. Ms. Hendrick stated that having a pull-through wash bay with a door on the north and south elevations is safest for their employees.

Mr. Roos asked if the proposed wash bay is mechanical or by hand. Ms. Hendrick stated that the cars are washed by hand.

Mr. Mees asked for clarification on the car's path leaving the wash bay. Ms. Hendrick stated that the cars would exit onto Wexford Avenue.

There was a discussion on the proposed façade materials for the wash bay and building.

Mr. Friedmann asked Mr. Brooks if he had any issues with the staff recommendation. Mr. Brooks stated that he had concerns about the wash bay and landscape buffer.

There was a discussion between the board and Mr. Brooks on the width of the proposed landscape buffer. Mr. Brooks noted that their proposal includes an eight (8) foot wide buffer.

Mr. Mees asked Mr. Brooks for clarification on how many feet the proposed wash bay is from the proposed landscape buffer. Mr. Brooks stated that from the wash bay to the street (Wexford Av) ROW line is fifty-three (53) feet.

The board discussed the conflicting numbers of feet. Staff measured fifty-six (56) feet, and Mr. Brooks measured fifty-three (53) feet. Mr. Brooks stated that the drive isle would be twenty-three (23) feet.

There was a discussion between the board and Ms. Hendrick on the proposed parking spaces. Ms. Hendrick stated that Enterprise had an agreement with the landlord to have dedicated parking spaces; however, it may be over twenty-four (24) spaces on a given day. Ms. Hendrick stated that Enterprise cannot pledge twenty-four (24) spaces because it may be less or more, depending on how busy they are. Mrs. Hendrick stated that forty-one (41) spaces, including the twelve (12) for Enterprise staff, would be sufficient.

Mr. Mees asked Ms. Hendrick if the parking agreement with the landlord was nonexclusive. Ms. Hendrick stated that the parking agreement with the landlord was shown on the submitted site plan as Exhibits "A" and "B".

Mr. Roos asked Ms. Hendrick how many employees they have on any given day. Ms. Hendrick stated that they typically have six (6) employees.

Mr. Uckotter stated that if the garage door is located in the rear, staff would be concerned with the aesthetics and the intensity of the use. Mr. Uckotter stated that it is concerning to staff that Enterprise is asking for forty-one (41) spaces. Mr. Uckotter presented the letter of intent from the applicant where twenty-four (24) parking spaces were referenced.

Mr. Friedmann asked if anyone else would like to speak. There was no comment from the audience.

Mr. Friedmann asked if anyone would like to make a motion.

Mr. Barrick moved that the board consider case 2024-07P2. Ms. Flanagan seconded the motion.

The board discussed the logistics of the case. Ms. Flanagan stated that she did not have an issue with the wash bay as proposed by the applicant and agreed with the staff's proposal prohibiting parking on the west side. Ms. Flanagan stated that her proposal is to allow the drive-thru wash bay, as proposed by the applicant, with doors on the north and south sides, no parking on the west side of the property, and additional parking to be located adjacent to the other parking shown on the staff plan. Ms. Flanagan noted for the record that she had concerns over the intensity of use.

Mr. Roos made a recommendation that there be a requirement stating that the garage door must be closed when it is not in use.

Mr. Mees stated that he feels the proposal and recommendation have multiple loose ends. He noted that the board's job is to make a recommendation based on what is presented, not to create a proposal for the applicant.

Mr. Barrick stated that the door's materials could make a difference aesthetically. He also discussed the parking situation and stated that he would like to see landscape buffer materials (the type of plants proposed).

Mr. Mees stated that it would be beneficial to see a plan from the applicant that included some of the details discussed by the board.

Mr. Friedmann stated that he did not have an issue with the drive-thru bay.

There was a discussion between Mr. Uckotter and the board on the width of the drive aisle and the discrepancy in numbers between what the applicant had on the original submission plans and what they proposed at the meeting. Mr. Uckotter noted that a ten (10) foot minimum wide landscape buffer is required.

Mr. Uckotter suggested that perhaps the case should be continued to allow the property owner (Paran) to attend the meeting.

Mr. Brooks and the board discussed the logistics of the proposed wash bay width, parking count, and dive aisle.

Mr. Brooks and Ms. Hendrick stated that they are requesting a continuance for case 2024-07P2.

Mr. Barrick stated that he would like to withdraw his motion, and Ms. Flanagan seconded.

None were opposed. All in favor

Mr. Friedmann noted that the next zoning commission meeting was scheduled for February 20th, 2025 at 6:00pm.

Item 5. - New Business

None

Item 6. – Organization of the Board

Mr. Friedmann stated that the board needed to elect new officers.

Mr. Roos made a motion to keep all positions as they stand.

All in favor. None opposed.

Mr. Mees called roll:

Ms. Flanagan – Aye

Mr. Barrick – Aye

Mr. Friedmann – Aye

Mr. Roos – Aye

Mr. Mees - Aye

Item 7. – Township Report

Mr. Friedmann asked Mr. Uckotter if there was anything to report. Mr. Uckotter stated that there are a few text changes coming before the board relating to signage and outdoor storage.

Item 8. – Date of next meeting

Thursday, February 20, 2025, at 6:00 p.m.

Item 9. - Adjournment

Mr. Roos moved to adjourn. Mr. Mees seconded. Mr. Friedmann called for a vote. All voted yes.

The meeting adjourned at 7:43 p.m.
1/9/2025 Meeting minutes recorded by Jon Ragan



Roger Friedmann, Chairman 2/20/25
Date



Bill Mees, Secretary 2/29/25
Date