

**Meeting Minutes
Sycamore Township Zoning Commission
Township Administration Building
8540 Kenwood Road
Thursday, April 10, 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, April 10, 2025.

Item 2. – Roll Call of the Board

Mr. Mees called the roll.

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

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Jeff Uckotter, Jon Ragan

Item 3. – Approval of March 13, 2025, Meeting Minutes

Mr. Friedmann asked if there was a motion to approve the March 13, 2025, meeting minutes.

Ms. Flanagan made a motion to approve the March 13, 2025, minutes.

Mr. Mees seconded the motion.

All in favor, none opposed.

Item 4. – Old Business – Tabled from March 13, 2025

Case: 2024-07P2

Applicant: Daniel R. Brooks (for Enterprise)

Location: 3912 E. Galbraith Road

Request: PUD II

Mr. Uckotter presented case 2024-07P2

Background: Mr. Uckotter noted that case 2024-07P2 was continued from the January 9, 2025, Meeting. Mr. Uckotter stated that a PUD-2 is necessary for the E-Retail District due to the proposed high-intensity use coupled with a high ISR over .65. Mr. Uckotter explained that Staff views the proposed automobile rental facility "Enterprise" as objectively intensive because the use stores automobile inventory in the outdoor parking lot, using more parking than the average retail use.

Proposal: Mr. Uckotter presented the plans submitted by the applicant, noting a few differences from the January submission. Mr. Uckotter showed the proposed landscape buffer in relation to four (4) parallel parking spaces (shown as plan north). Mr. Uckotter explained the applicant's proposed addition of six (6) new parking spaces (shown as plan northwest). Mr. Uckotter showed the proposed car washing bay noting that the proposal includes cars entering from the south and exiting to the north. Mr. Uckotter reviewed the applicants' parking proposal stating that the current count with six (6) new spaces equals 739 spaces. Mr. Uckotter noted that at the January meeting the applicant's proposal was a 24-vehicle limit, however, it was raised to 41 vehicles at that meeting.

Staff Comments: Mr. Uckotter stated that the applicant's current proposal proposes no vehicle number cap and no designated spaces. Mr. Uckotter stated that the parking proposal is concerning for staff because the use could blossom into a more intense use and negatively affect other businesses. Mr. Uckotter stated that staff recommends a vehicle intensity cap and a site arrangement requiring exclusive Enterprise parking in conspicuous zones. Regarding the proposed washing bay, Mr. Uckotter stated that staff recommends the material shall be reverted to the high-quality masonry finish as shown in the original submission – not the EIFS shown in the current proposal. Mr. Uckotter stated that no vehicle detailing shall occur outside of the wash bay, and the wash bay shall not employ the use of jet or motorized dryers. Mr. Uckotter also stated that no enterprise vehicle shall be queued/parked to the side or rear of the building and no Enterprise vehicles shall use Wexford Ave. Mr. Uckotter stated that the proposed ten (10) foot landscape buffer is insufficient to provide the necessary screening for the wash bay. Mr. Uckotter stated that staff recommends a condition removing the four (4) parallel parking spaces and extending the curb landscape buffer.

Staff Recommendation: Mr. Uckotter stated that staff recommends approval of the PUD II with the following conditions:

1. The exterior material of the washing structure shall be reverted to the high-quality masonry finish as shown in the original submission.
2. No vehicle detailing shall occur outside of the wash bay. All rental vehicle detailing shall occur in the wash bay (e.g., no vehicle sweeping or car detailing shall occur in any portion of the parking lot.)
3. The wash bay shall not employ the use of jet or other motorized dryers.
4. 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.

5. The four proposed parallel parking spaces shall be removed from the plan, and the landscape buffer shall be extended into the area proposed for parallel parking – the landscape buffer shall be protected by a concrete curb and shall be approved by staff prior to the approval of the Zoning Compliance Plan. The two-way drive aisle to the west of the building shall be twenty feet wide. Under this schematic, the parking count is 734.
6. The surplus parking count is 34 parking spaces. In turn, an Enterprise rental vehicle intensity cap (the daily rental inventory on the parking lot) of 34 shall be required.
7. A site arrangement shall be required requiring exclusive Enterprise parking in conspicuous zones somewhere on the parking lot that guarantees sufficient parking for other businesses, or the inverse, a site arrangement requiring that Enterprise not park vehicles in certain parking areas that guarantees sufficient parking for other businesses.
8. 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.
9. All landscaping shall be maintained in healthy condition and shall be replaced if the landscaping dies or is in unhealthy condition.
10. Enterprise acknowledges that if the 34 -vehicle limit is eclipsed, the car rental use would be at risk of the zoning certificate being revoked or potential legal action.
11. 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.
12. Although Enterprise does not propose a dumpster, if Enterprise seeks a dumpster in the future, a masonry dumpster enclosure is required—consistent with the Zoning Resolution.

Discussion: The applicant and architect, Daniel R. Brooks (1517 Oak Knoll Dr. Cincinnati, OH 45224) introduced himself from the podium. Mr. Brooks stated that there was a revision in the plans based on the wishes of the Township and the property owner. Mr. Brooks stated that the proposed landscape buffer is sufficient for screening and no cars will be detailed outside of the wash bay. Mr. Brooks stated that the proposed EIFS on the wash bay would match the existing primary building.

Jennifer Hendrick (4600 McAuley PL 5th Floor, Cincinnati, OH 45242) introduced herself from the podium and Joe DelBalso (2720 Van Aken Blvd #200, Cleveland, Ohio 44120) introduced himself from the podium. Ms. Hendrick stated that designated parking spaces do not work for the tenant. Mr. DelBalso stated that from a property owner prospective designated parking is not feasible.

Mr. Mees stated that because the proposed inventory is stored outside, it is reasonable to calculate the number of vehicles proposed versus the number of spaces available. Mr. Mees stated that ultimately parking needs to follow the zoning code.

There was a discussion between Mr. Uckotter and the Board on how parking numbers are calculated per the zoning resolution for retail sites.

Eileen Siefke (8429 Wicklow Ave, 45236) introduced herself from the podium. Ms. Siefke stated that her concern with the proposal is the safety of the children that walk the street

and people walking with strollers. Ms. Siefke stated that the number of cars coming and going is her concern.

Mr. Roos asked Mr. Uckotter about the width of the proposed drive isle between the four (4) parallel parking spaces and the washing bay. Mr. Uckotter stated the space is twenty feet wide.

Ms. Flanagan stated that she felt it would be beneficial to have designated Enterprise parking zones. Mr. Friedmann stated that he agreed with that statement. Ms. Flanagan stated that she recommends an amendment to condition seven (7) to include exclusive Enterprise parking in identified zones, an amendment to condition six (6) to include a cap of 40 vehicles, and an amendment to condition ten (10) stating 40 vehicles instead of 34.

There was a discussion between the board regarding the proposed EIFS versus high-quality masonry material for the wash bay. Mr. Roos noted that brick material is hard to match. Mr. Uckotter presented the google street view showing the existing material. Mr. Friedmann stated that a combination of masonry and EIFS could be a compromise.

Ms. Flanagan moved that case 2024- 07P2 is considered with the following conditions:

Conditions of Approval:

1. The exterior material of the washing structure shall be a combination of EIFS and high-quality masonry finish, consistent with the existing shopping center.
2. No vehicle detailing shall occur outside of the wash bay. All rental vehicle detailing shall occur in the wash bay (e.g., no vehicle sweeping or car detailing shall occur in any portion of the parking lot.)
3. The wash bay shall not employ the use of jet or other motorized dryers.
4. No Enterprise vehicle shall be queued/ parked to 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.
5. The two-way drive aisle to the west of the building shall be twenty feet wide.
6. An Enterprise rental vehicle intensity cap (the daily rental inventory on the parking lot) of 40 shall be required.
7. A site arrangement shall be required requiring exclusive Enterprise parking in identified zones.
8. 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.
9. All landscaping shall be maintained in healthy condition and shall be replaced if the landscaping dies or is in unhealthy condition.
10. Enterprise acknowledges that if the 40 -vehicle limit is eclipsed, the car rental use would be at risk of the zoning certificate being revoked or potential legal action.
11. This approval solely applies to the Enterprise Rental Company use only – any other car rental or sale 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.
12. Although Enterprise does not propose a dumpster, if Enterprise seeks a dumpster in the future, a masonry dumpster enclosure is required—consistent with the Zoning Resolution.

Mr. Mees seconded the motion.

Mr. Friedmann asked if anyone had further discussion. There was none.

Mr. Mees called roll:

Ms. Flanagan – Aye
Mr. Barrick- Aye
Mr. Friedmann – Aye
Mr. Roos - Aye
Mr. Mees – Aye

Item 5. - New Business

None.

Item 6. – Township Report

Mr. Friedmann asked Mr. Uckotter if there was anything to report. Mr. Uckotter stated case 2024- 07P2 will be heard by the Trustees on Tuesday May 6, 2025.

Item 7. – Date of next meeting

Thursday, May 8, 2025, at 6:00 p.m.

Item 8. - Adjournment

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

The meeting adjourned at 7:13 p.m.

4/10/2025 Meeting minutes recorded by Jon Ragan

 9/11/25

Roger Friedmann, Chairman Date

 9/11/25

Bill Mees, Secretary Date