

**Meeting Minutes**  
**Sycamore Township Zoning Commission**  
**Township Administration Building**  
**8540 Kenwood Road**  
**Monday, June 10, 2024**  
**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  
Bill Swanson - Alternate

**Item 1. – Meeting called to Order**

Mr. Friedmann called the meeting of the Zoning Commission to order at 6:00 p.m. on Monday, June 10, 2024.

**Item 2. – Roll Call of the Board**

Mr. Mees called the roll.

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

Members Absent: Mr. Barrick, Mr. Swanson

Staff Present: Jeff Uckotter, Kevin Clark, Jon Ragan

**Item 3. – Approval of April 08, 2024, Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Friedmann asked if there was a motion to approve the April 08, 2024, meeting minutes.

Mr. Roos made a motion to approve the April 08, 2024, minutes.

Mr. Mees seconded the motion.

All in favor, none opposed.

**Item 4. – Old Business**

None.

## **Item 5. -New Business**

Case: 2024-02MA

Applicant: Redknot Homes

Location: 8810 Montgomery Road

Request: Major adjustment to a PUD

**Proposal:** Mr. Uckotter stated that the applicant proposes a two-story office building at (3,763 net sf, 5,665 gross sf). Mr. Uckotter stated that the second floor is proposed as the Redknot corporate office, and the first floor is for a separate tenant. Mr. Uckotter stated that the proposal does not exceed the 35' maximum height requirement (measured to the midpoint of the roof) (STZR Table 5-5). Mr. Uckotter reviewed the current zoning "OO" – Planned Office District, and the nearby recent history of the site, citing cases 2023-01MA, 2022-10Z, 2018-13MA, and 2008-0Z.

Mr. Uckotter presented the site plan stating that the proposed parking plan is sufficient if only one story is medical office use. Mr. Uckotter stated that if both floors were medical office use - parking would be insufficient and a major adjustment to the PUD would need to be applied for.

Mr. Uckotter stated that the proposed landscaping plan does not meet the minimum requirements found in chapter 14 of the STZR. Mr. Uckotter noted that a condition would be proposed requiring the applicant to meet the minimum requirements of the buffering standards.

Mr. Uckotter read neighboring correspondence from John Misali (8829 Lyncris Drive) expressing concern over drainage, the massing of the proposed building, lighting, and landscaping. Mr. Uckotter read correspondence from Ryan Bonaventura (8800 Montgomery Road) expressing concern over the height and massing of the proposed building.

**Recommendation:** Mr. Uckotter stated that staff recommends approval of the Major Adjustment to the PUD with the following conditions:

1. *If approved, this case supersedes case 2023-01MA.*
2. Related to the use of the office building, not more than one floor shall be used for medical office use. If a second medical office tenant is sought in the future, a major adjustment case will be required. A Medical office use shall be considered as the following: *A building or portion thereof where human patients are accepted for examination and treatment by members of the medical, optical, mental health/talk therapy, dental/oral, other healing arts profession, or the like in group or individual practice but who are not lodged overnight.*
3. Along the entire length of the subject property (less the ingress/egress curb cut), a curb shall be installed along Montgomery Road in or near ROW, consistent with ODOT specifications; existing abandoned asphalt apron shall be removed.
4. A photometric plan showing light levels of at most .5 footcandles at the property lines and examples of downward-facing light fixtures will be recommended. If permissible by building

code, a motion sensor shall be used for any lighting in the rear of the building.

5. The building materials shall NOT include EIFS and include brick forged to be white, not painted white. All other building materials shall be included as shown in this case.
6. The landscape plan shall be revised to sufficiently meet the minimum requirements of the buffering standards. All landscaping shall be maintained in healthy condition.
7. The monument sign location shall be added to the site plan, 10 feet from all property lines and ROW, and be subject to O-Office sign regulations.
8. Tenant wall signs shall be subject to the O-Office sign regulations. In the event that one tenant occupies the entire building, only one wall sign is permitted.
9. A placeholder masonry dumpster enclosure location should be shown on the site plan in the event of the need for a future dumpster.
10. Comments from the Water Works and MSD relating to utility capacity are required; these comments shall be included in the Approved Zoning Compliance Plan.
11. The project shall conform to the regulations of the Hamilton County Soil/Water Conservation District; Hamilton County Soil/Water Conservation District comments shall be included in the approved Zoning Compliance Plan.
12. As the ingress and egress are shared with 8812 Montgomery Road, an executed copy of the ingress and egress easement shall be included in the approved Zoning Compliance Plan.
13. No outdoor advertising, billboards, or telecommunications towers shall be permitted on the site.

Mark Pottebaum (President of Redknot Homes) introduced himself from the podium. Mr. Pottebaum stated that Redknot Homes proposes to have their offices on the second floor of the building, leaving the first floor for expansion. Mr. Pottebaum spoke on the height of the building stating that the massing of the building would be pushed towards Montgomery Road and away from the neighboring residential. Mr. Pottebaum stated that that storm water from the site will be collected by the stormwater detention system.

Mr. Uckotter asked about the proposal for the rear windows shown on the plan associated with the parking garage.

Mr. Pottebaum stated that Redknot Homes is open to suggestions regarding the parking garage windows.

Mr. Friedmann asked Mr. Pottebaum if there was an existing retention system on the site.

Mr. Pottebaum showed the location of the existing retention system (pointed to the site plan on the display screen).

Mr. Mees asked about the proposal to improve the existing retention system.

Mr. Mees asked where a swale would be located if constructed on the property.

Stephen Hebert with Tutoring Properties (8810-8812 Montgomery Road) introduced himself from the program. Mr. Hebert stated that he installed the existing storm water retention system. Mr. Hebert explained how the current retention system works.

Mr. Uckotter noted that Sycamore Township yields to Hamilton County for water runoff and discharge regulation.

John Misali (8829 Lyncris Drive) introduced himself from the podium. Mr. Misali stated that he would hate to see the applicant install a dumpster because it would be located in the rear of the property near his residence. Mr. Misali expressed concern over the size of the proposed building and the lighting at the rear of the property. Mr. Misali stated that he would like a swale considered for the site.

Mr. Friedmann asked Mr. Misali if he had ponding water on his property.

Mr. Misali stated that his property gets a little bit of overflow during heavy rains, however not every time it rains.

Marsha Butler (8845 Lyncris Drive) introduced herself from the podium. Ms. Butler stated that she is concerned about the height of the building. Ms. Butler stated that she gets overflow water into her yard from the subject property. Ms. Butler stated that she would like to see more screening at the rear of the property.

Mr. Mees asked Mr. Uckotter if the proposed height of the building is within the zoning code requirements.

Mr. Uckotter stated that the code allows for a building 35' high at mid-peak, therefore, the proposed building's height is below the maximum requirement.

Mr. Mees asked if the footprint of the proposed building would go where the previously approved building was proposed.

Mr. Uckotter stated that Mr. Mees was correct, and the current proposal (subject of this case) is less ISR (impervious surface ratio) than the previously proposed case of 2023.

Ms. Flanagan moved that case 2024-02MA be considered with the thirteen (13) conditions noted by staff - with an addition to condition four (4), "underground parking windows shall screen light from the underground parking area".

There was discussion between Mr. Uckotter and Ms. Flanagan on how lighting could be screened from the underground parking garage at night.

Ms. Flanagan amended the addition to condition four (4) stating "underground parking windows shall screen any emitted light from the underground parking area during the evening hours".

Mr. Roos seconded the motion.

Mr. Mees mentioned the proposed swale as a condition.

Mr. Uckotter suggested an addition to condition eleven (11) stating "before the approval of the zoning compliance plan, the applicant must consult the Hamilton County Soil and Water District as well as the Hamilton County Conservation District".

Ms. Flanagan suggested that an addition to condition eleven (11) state "the applicant shall provide a drainage swale to mitigate the amount of runoff water to adjoining properties".

Ms. Flanagan stated that she would like to amend her motion to consider case 2024-02MA with the thirteen (13) conditions to include the addition to condition four (4) and the addition to condition eleven (11). (See Exhibit A, page 9).

Mr. Mees called roll:

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

Mr. Uckotter stated that case 2024-02MA will be heard by the Sycamore Township Trustees on July 9<sup>th</sup>, 2024, at 6:00pm.

Case: 2024-03P2  
Applicant: Greg Henghold  
Location: 7660 School Road  
Request: PUD2

**Proposal:** Mr. Uckotter stated that the applicant is requesting the construction of five (5) contractor bay storage facilities on lot two (2) of the subject property. Mr. Uckotter stated that the PUD2 request is necessary because the proposal triggers an ISR (impervious surface ratio) that requires a PUD2. Mr. Uckotter explained the proposed split of the lot into lot one (1) and lot two (2). Mr. Uckotter spoke on parking and screening noting that fencing and a masonry dumpster enclosure are included in the proposal. Mr. Uckotter stated that the signage for lot two (2) would be located on lot one (1) (bidFTA site) ten (10) feet from the ROW line and zero (0) feet from the west property line.

Mr. Roos asked for clarification on where the sign is proposed.

Mr. Uckotter shed clarification via the site plan that was presented.

Mr. Roos stated that he is familiar with the bidFTA site and noted that the parking lot is always busy.

Mr. Uckotter stated that the applicant assured him that no existing parking would be lost.

Mr. Uckotter spoke on the bidFTA site and the existing front facing exposed dumpster on the site. Mr. Uckotter noted that an alternate location would be proposed for the dumpster.

**Recommendation:** Mr. Uckotter stated that staff recommends approval of the PUD2 with the following conditions:

1. Lots 1 and 2 shall be split and recorded with the Hamilton County Tax Map Office before approval of the Zoning Compliance Plan.
2. Related to Lot 2 (the back panhandle lot), there shall be a prohibition of outdoor storage and all auto mechanic and autobody repair uses.
3. The pavement limit that runs along the panhandle to Lot 2 shall be made clearer in relation to the site plan.
4. All landscaping shall be maintained in healthy condition. The landscape plan shall be amended to show:
  - a. The five crab-apple trees along School Road on lot one will be replaced with a suitable street tree, listed at 2" caliper (B&B) at planting.
  - b. The amendment of the landscape key to show:
    - i. The Bald Cypress shall be listed to show a 2" caliper (B&B)
    - ii. The Skyline Honey Locust shall list 15 in total and as a 2" caliper (B&B) at planting.
5. Monument sign: The monument sign, proposed on Lot 1, shall serve Lots 1 and 2 and be memorialized by an executed perpetual easement prior to approval of the Zoning Compliance Plan. The monument sign shall not exceed 8 feet in height and 64 square feet in sign face. It may be sited at least 10 feet from the School Road ROW and 0 feet from the left side yard setback.
6. Lot 2 Wall Signage: Each tenant may have a 3'x3 wall sign mounted two feet above the tenant's man-door. A tenant may only have one wall sign per tenant space.
7. To aid in ensuring that traffic generated from Lot 1 is directed to the appropriate parking lot in the rear of Lot 1 and not erroneously to the parking area of Lot 2, at least one ground-mounted directional sign shall be required for efficient direction of traffic.
8. Related to lot 1, the site plan shall be corrected to show the correct parking schematic and parking count in the rear parking lot of lot 1.
9. Related to lot 1, the dumpster located in the front of the building shall be moved to a different location out of view of School Road, and a masonry enclosure shall be built around it to enclose the dumpster, as required by Section 10-5 of the Zoning Resolution.
10. No outdoor advertising, billboards, or telecommunications towers shall be permitted on the site.
11. The project shall conform to the regulations of the Hamilton County Soil/Water Conservation District; Hamilton County Soil/Water Conservation District/ Storm Water Department comments shall be included in the approved Zoning Compliance Plan.
12. Comments from the Water Works relating to utility capacity are required; these comments shall be included in the approved Zoning Compliance Plan.
13. Comments from the Hamilton County Planning + Development Department affirming the legality of the panhandle are required; these comments shall be included in the Approved Zoning Compliance Plan.

14. The executed perpetual ingress/ egress easement agreement between the property owners of 7650 and 7660 School Road shall be included in the approved Zoning Compliance Plan.
15. All fire department comments shall be installed into the site plan via a note or, in the case of the fire hydrant location, directly into the plan.

Ms. Flanagan asked if there was a need for five (5) contractor bay storage facilities rather than four (4). Ms. Flanagan asked if there were numbers showing how the ISR would be affected if there were four (4) buildings instead of five (5).

Mr. Uckotter stated that the proposed ISR, density and intensity of the proposed use was not a concern from a staff perspective and the ISR of lot two (2) is 0.69. Mr. Uckotter stated that the traffic generated from the proposed lot two (2) development would be of more passive use than lot one (1).

There was discussion between Mr. Uckotter and Mr. Roos on the relocation of the dumpster for lot one (1).

Mr. Mees asked for clarification on what the use of the proposed buildings would be.

Mr. Uckotter stated that there is storage/warehouse component as well as a business component or office component, however, there would be no outdoor storage of vehicles or materials.

Greg Henghold (the applicant) introduced himself from the podium. Mr. Henghold stated that he is one of the owners of the investment group that is proposing the project. Mr. Henghold stated that generally it is contractors who use the storage bays as storage for materials and their commercial vehicles that cannot be parked in a residential area. Mr. Henghold stated that from an investment and return perspective, five (5) contractor bays rather than four (4) would make the project feasible. Mr. Henghold stated that there would be absolutely no storage of outside materials.

Mr. Roos asked if the site would be gated.

Mr. Henghold stated that there would be an electric gate for lot two (2) restricting access.

There was discussion between the applicant and the Board regarding the panhandle driveway.

Mr. Roos made a motion to consider case 2024-03P2 with the fifteen (15) staff recommended conditions.

Mr. Mees seconded the motion.





## Exhibit A – Case 2024-02MA

1. *If approved, this case supersedes case 2023-01MA.*
2. Related to the use of the office building, not more than one floor shall be used for medical office use. If a second medical office tenant is sought in the future, a major adjustment case will be required. A Medical office use shall be considered as the following: *A building or portion thereof where human patients are accepted for examination and treatment by members of the medical, optical, mental health/talk therapy, dental/oral, other healing arts profession, or the like in group or individual practice but who are not lodged overnight.*
3. Along the entire length of the subject property (less the ingress/egress curb cut), a curb shall be installed along Montgomery Road in or near ROW, consistent with ODOT specifications; existing abandoned asphalt apron shall be removed.
4. A photometric plan showing light levels of at most .5 footcandles at the property lines and examples of downward-facing light fixtures will be recommended. If permissible by building code, a motion sensor shall be used for any lighting in the rear of the building. Underground parking windows shall screen any omitted light from the underground parking area during the evening hours.
5. The building materials shall NOT include EIFS and include brick forged to be white, not painted white. All other building materials shall be included as shown in this case.
6. The landscape plan shall be revised to sufficiently meet the minimum requirements of the buffering standards. All landscaping shall be maintained in healthy condition.
7. The monument sign location shall be added to the site plan, 10 feet from all property lines and ROW, and be subject to O-Office sign regulations.
8. Tenant wall signs shall be subject to the O-Office sign regulations. In the event that one tenant occupies the entire building, only one wall sign is permitted.
9. A placeholder masonry dumpster enclosure location should be shown on the site plan in the event of the need for a future dumpster.
10. Comments from the Water Works and MSD relating to utility capacity are required; these comments shall be included in the Approved Zoning Compliance Plan.
11. The project shall conform to the regulations of the Hamilton County Soil/Water Conservation District; Hamilton County Soil/Water Conservation District comments shall be included in the approved Zoning Compliance Plan. The applicant shall provide a drainage swale to mitigate the amount of runoff water to adjoining properties.
12. As the ingress and egress are shared with 8812 Montgomery Road, an executed copy of the ingress and egress easement shall be included in the approved Zoning Compliance Plan.
13. No outdoor advertising, billboards, or telecommunications towers shall be permitted on the site.