

PLANNING BOARD MEETING
TIPP CITY, MIAMI COUNTY, OHIO SEPTEMBER 8, 2015

Meeting	Chairman Stacy Wall called the meeting of the Tipp City Planning Board to order at 7:30 p.m.
Roll Call	Roll call showed the following Board members present: Vonda Alberson, Andrew Thornbury, Jamie DeSantis, and Stacy Wall. Others in attendance: Zoning Administrator Matt Spring, Board Secretary Kelly Rowlands, City Manager Tim Eggleston, Finance Director John Green, Zach Vargo, Janelle Vargo, Jan Vargo, Steve Swihart, Neil Ranly and Reporter Nancy Bowman.
Approval of Minutes – August 11, 2015	Mr. Thornbury moved to approve the minutes of the August 11, 2015 meeting as written. Ms. DeSantis seconded the motion. Motion passed 4-0.
Items Not on the Agenda	There were no comments on items not on the agenda.
Administration of Oath	Board Secretary Rowlands administered the oath to anyone that was wishing to speak during the public hearing.
<u>New Business</u>	
Public Hearing: City of Tipp City – Zoning Code Amendment (Code 154.06(A)(4)(t)(iv)(A)) – Installation of Roof-Mounted Solar Panels	Ms. DeSantis moved to open the Public Hearing. Ms. Alberson seconded the motion. Motion passed 4-0. Zoning Administrator Spring provided the following report: On August 11, 2015, Planning Board set a Public Hearing for this evening to consider a Zoning Code amendment for Code §154.06(A)(4)(t)(iv)(A) regarding the installation of roof-mounted solar panels. The current Code requires that all roof-mounted solar panels be either integrated with the surface of the roof or flush mounted (i.e. completely level & even with the existing roof). However, solar industry standards indicate that “flush mounted” solar panels are installed on carrying rails, parallel to the roof surface, that elevate the panels ±2”-6” above the surface of the roof. Staff notes that the Board of Zoning Appeals recently granted a variance (4/15/15) that allowed a solar panel installation with this solar industry standard type of “flush mounting” (i.e. ± 2”-6” above the surface of the roof). A second more recent, proposed solar panel installation has been delayed and will be in front of the Board of Zoning Appeals next week.

Accordingly, staff proposes a modification to Code that would allow for solar panels to be mounted/installed up to 6" above the surface of the roof.

Actual Code section is listed as Attachment "A" in the Staff Report.

Ms. Wall asked if the new language should be so specific. Especially the statement, "up to 6" above the surface of the roof." By making it specific, the possibility arises of having to amend the Code every time the industry standard changes. Further, Ms. Wall asked if Code could just say solar panels should be mounted/installed according to industry standards.

Mr. Spring said that was something that could be considered by the Planning Board this evening.

Going further, Mr. Spring provided a little history on the current Code. He was involved in writing the original Code that talked about flush mounting. At that time, aesthetics were certainly discussed. The Code amendment includes the 6" limit to keep the panels close to the surface of the roof and to continue to consider aesthetics.

Mr. Spring continued by saying he does not know what future standards might entail. He does know that another portion of the Code states that if the solar panel has to be anything but parallel to the existing roof structure there are different requirements. In other words, if the panel has to be angled higher than the actual angle of the roof. In these cases, the solar panels must be mounted/installed on the rear portion of the home. This maintains aesthetics.

This particular section deals with any portion of the roof and sets the 6" parallel to the surface of the roof requirement. The Planning Board can certainly change any wording as they see fit.

Ms. Wall asked if the recommendation made by the Planning Board this evening goes to City Council. She also asked if City Council could then change whatever is proposed here. Mr. Spring stated that she was correct regarding the Planning Board recommendation going to Council and that they could modify whatever is proposed.

Ms. Wall solicited comments from other Planning Board members regarding her language change proposal.

Mr. Thornbury asked if the solar panel is tilted could there be any conflict with language changes that may or may not be proposed this evening.

Mr. Spring answered that there could be conflict. He then explained, hypothetically, what if industry standards changed and stated that new solar panels should be installed at some sort of a tilt beyond the angle of the roof. This Code section would then be in conflict with the other part that states that any solar panel that is to be installed at a tilt higher than the actual angle of the roof must be in the rear of the home.

Ms. Alberson questioned "industry standards" and what standards are

we citing. Is there something specific? Are there standards that are recognized across the industry?

Mr. Spring stated that he doesn't know of one voice that speaks for the entire solar industry. Both staff research and the candidate that came before the Board of Zoning Appeals, indicate that the original Code from 2008 included a generic term "solar panel." This was meant to include not only panels that would heat up water for home use, but also photovoltaics, which actually generates electrical power. Today, most people who use the term solar panel, mean photovoltaics.

Further research indicates that the photovoltaics are always rail mounted onto the roof's surface. The rails are 3"-4" in height and the panels ride on the rails. The distance between the panels and the surface of the roof allow for air to circulate and panels to cool.

When the Code was originally written there was a way to flush mount the solar panels, but it did not include photovoltaics. Solar panels that were designed to heat water for home use were the only panels that could be flush mounted.

Since 2008 there has been a lot of changes in the industry. There have been many innovations and almost all installations of panels are for electrical power generation.

Ms. Alberson stated that her concern with the statement "industry standards" is that the industry is ever-changing and there is a possibility that there might not be "standards" that everyone agrees upon.

Ms. DeSantis **moved to close the Public Hearing.** Ms. Wall seconded the motion. Motion passed 4-0.

Mr. Thornbury began the discussion period by asking if language was changed tonight, would there be essentially two different regulations – one for the front of the residence and one for the back.

Mr. Spring stated that the Code amendment in question would apply to any roof surface of a home, but if you had to tilt the panel, it would have to be located on the rear.

Ms. Wall indicated that she hated to write language this specific because you always have to come back and update the Code. However, she understands that there is no real industry standard.

No further discussion.

Ms. Alberson **moved to forward a positive recommendation to City Council regarding this proposed Code amendment to Code §154.06(A)(4)(t)(iv)(A).** Ms. DeSantis seconded the motion. Motion passed 3-1. Ms. Wall voted no.

**Special Use Permit:
Zach Vargo – 475 S.
First St. –
Commercial
Recreation Facilities
(Indoors)**

The applicant is seeking a Special Use Permit from the Planning Board for the proposed establishment of Commercial Recreation Facilities (Indoors) at the existing structure located at 475 S. First Street. Staff notes that 475 S. First Street has been vacant since 2009, and was formerly an industrial machine shop.

The applicant has indicated in the application materials (Attachment "A") that the proposed use of the property will be an indoor training, testing and development center for athletes. The facility will also include group exercise programs including weight loss, general fitness, power lifting, yoga, Pilates, and so forth.

Staff notes that a training and development center for athletes that would include group exercise programs is not specifically listed in Code. However, the Zoning Administrator has made the determination [based on Code §154.04(F)(2)(f)] that the proposed use is substantially similar to *Commercial Recreation Facilities (Indoors)*, and shall be reviewed as such in this staff report.

There are two groups of requirements – general and specific. Most of the general requirements are somewhat mundane. So, Mr. Spring stated that he would just skim through those items.

The first criteria is that it is established as a special use. Based on Code, the proposed training and development center will be reviewed as an Indoor Commercial Recreational facility.

Another criteria is that the proposed use is consistent with the spirit and purpose of the Code. It is the opinion of the staff that the proposed training and development center is consistent with the spirit and purpose of the Code.

Next, the proposed use must comply with any use-specific standards. This will be discussed further in just a moment.

Further, the proposed use shall be adequately served by essential public facilities. Water, sewer, and electric are already available on-site.

General Requirement (e) of the Special Use Review Criteria does not pertain to the proposed Special Use since it is not in a residential zoning district.

Requirement (f), which states that the proposed use will comply with all applicable development standards, except as specifically altered by the Planning Board will be discussed in further detail later.

Next, the proposed use will be harmonious with the existing or intended character of the general vicinity. It is the opinion of the staff that the proposed training and development center would be harmonious with the existing/intended character of the general vicinity.

Continuing, the proposed use will not involve uses, activities, processes, materials, equipment and conditions of operation that will be detrimental to any persons or property. Once again, staff's opinion

is that the proposed training and development center would not involve activities that would be detrimental to the area.

Criteria (i) says that the circulation on and access to the property shall be so designed as not to create an interference with traffic on surrounding public thoroughfares. It is the opinion of the staff that access to the property (ingress/egress) is adequate and would not create interference with traffic on surrounding public thoroughfares. Staff does note that existing off-street parking and circulation is nonconforming and limited in nature. This will be discussed in further detail later.

Since there is no construction proposed, criteria (j) does not apply. Criteria (j) states that the design of the buildings, structures, and site will not result in the destruction, loss or damage of a natural, scenic, or historic feature of major importance.

Criteria (k) states that the proposed use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property. Once again, it is the opinion of the staff that the proposed training and development center would not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property.

Finally, whenever no specific areas, frontage, height, or setback requirements are specified in provision for a specific special uses, then such use shall be subject to the site development standards for the zoning district. This will be discussed in further detail next.

Moving on, Mr. Spring began discussing the specific requirements for Commercial Recreation Facilities (Indoors).

First of all, activities related to the principal use, except parking, shall be located within an enclosed building. The application material indicates that all activities associated with the proposed use would be located within the existing building.

Specific Requirement (b) states that all structures shall be set back a minimum of 50 feet from all lot lines and street rights-of-way. The particular property in question has the following setbacks:

Front: $\pm 128'$
Rear: $\pm 53'$
Sides (left) $\pm 21'$ and (right) $\pm 1.2'$

Staff recommends that Planning Board waive the minimum 50' setback requirements for this existing structure and associated Special Use in accordance with Code which states:

The Planning Board shall be authorized to waive or modify requirements that apply to the special use as may be necessary to achieve compatible development with adjacent land areas as well as in the interest of the community in general where the Planning Board finds that such waiver or modification will further the protection of the general welfare, protect individual property rights, and ensure that the special use will meet the intent and purposes of this code.

Criteria (c) states that when located adjacent to a residential lot, there shall be a solid fence or masonry wall that is at least six feet in height that shall be located along the lot line adjacent to the residential use. To the rear or west of the property, there are two properties that are residentially zoned (750 & 754 S. Third Street). Staff notes that there is an existing 6' tall privacy fence along a portion of the boundary, with the remaining boundary as a wooded area. Staff also recommends that Planning Board waive (partially) the fencing requirement for this Special Use in accordance with Code as noted above.

Specific Requirement (d) states that new uses shall be located along an arterial or collector street, as defined by the City Engineer. Staff notes that S. First Street is classified by the Tipp City Thoroughfare Plan as a "Major Collector," with no residential uses in the area of service. Attachment "E" of the Staff Report shows this if you are interested.

Regarding off-street parking, Code indicates that Commercial Recreation Facilities (Indoors) are required to provide one space for each person at capacity, Code indicates that "capacity"

...shall be based on the typical, or average, number of persons working on a single shift, the typical, or average, enrollment, or the maximum fire-rated capacity, whichever is lesser.

Staff notes that the "lesser" capacity rating would be the typical or average enrollment of the training facility, which would be approximately 23 persons, according to the applicant. Thus, the minimum number of off-street parking spaces required is 23. However, as noted above, the existing off-street parking and interior circulation pattern is nonconforming and limited in nature due to the following:

- The existing front parking area/driveway is an unstriped asphalt pad \pm 47' x 60' with a capacity for approximately six vehicles. This asphalt also provides access to the front garage door.
- Also, in the front of the lot there is a \pm 35' x 60' non-conforming gravel pad adjacent (east) to the asphalt pad noted above.
- There is another unstriped asphalt pad at the rear of the lot (\pm 65' x 30'), with a capacity for approximately six additional vehicles. However, the overall width of the lot and the position of the existing building limits access to the rear of the lot, with the only access being a 21' wide/one-way drive aisle on the south side of the building.

Regarding existing nonconforming off-street parking areas, Code states:

(d) Where a site is legally nonconforming due to a lack of compliance with the parking, loading, or stacking space requirements of this section, a future use of the site need not comply with the required number of spaces provided:

- (i) *The applicant provides the maximum amount of parking, loading, or stacking spaces possible without being required to remove or partially remove a structure.*

Based on the configuration of the existing site, the applicant has not yet provided the maximum amount of off-street parking that could be established. Staff notes that paving an additional $\pm 20' \times 60'$ section of the existing gravel pad in the front yard area would allow for the striping of 12 (twelve) $10' \times 20'$ parking spaces with the required 24' wide drive aisle in between for ingress/egress (see attachment "J"). It is the opinion of the Zoning Administrator that paving (asphalt or concrete) this additional $\pm 20' \times 60'$ section of the existing gravel pad would meet the requirements of Code 154.10(C)(1)(d)(i), and could thus be approved as meeting the requirements for off-street parking as a nonconformity. The applicant is in agreement with this additional paving concept and has indicated that although the proposed parking configuration would block the front garage door, that the blockage would not be a problem due to the fact that the east garage door will not be used, and that a second garage door (south) was available for use of the side of the building.

One additional note, the existing building setbacks and off-street parking configuration was approved by Planning Board in September of 1997 (see attachments "H" & "I").

Staff recommends the following:

- 1.) The Planning Board waive the minimum setback requirements for this existing structure and associated Special Use in accordance with Code and in light of the previous site plan approval of the Planning Board in September of 1997.
- 2.) The Planning Board waive (partially) the rear fencing requirement for this Special Use in accordance with Code and in light of the previous site plan approval of the Planning Board in September of 1997.
- 3.) The applicant will construct/establish 12 (twelve) standard striped off-street parking spaces with associated drive aisle and asphalt paving per Code prior to occupancy, or post surety in the amount of an approved engineer's estimate for same to be constructed no later than 9/1/16.
- 4.) With the exception of the above, that the Planning Board finds that the proposed Indoor Commercial Recreation Facility (i.e. Vargo Training and Development Center) meets or exceeds the requirements of Code and grants a Special Use Permit for the same.
- 5.) The applicant will obtain the required Zoning Occupancy/Change of Use Permit.

Zach Vargo, 2281 Old Springfield Rd., Vandalia, OH 45377, approached the podium.

Ms. Wall asked Mr. Vargo if he intended to use this facility for any other purpose than training athletes.

Mr. Vargo stated that everything would be related to physical training. Weight loss groups, power lifting, and yoga are just a few examples of

other activities that could occur potentially.

Mr. Thornbury inquired if 12 parking spaces would be enough for the anticipated 23 enrollees.

Mr. Vargo stated that 23 is the number of individuals that he is currently working with, but a majority of those are junior high and high school athletes. Many parents drop off kids or individuals carpool. Last week Mr. Vargo counted 4 or 5 cars in the parking lot. With fit groups, Mr. Vargo tracked 6 or 7 vehicles. With all that being said, Mr. Vargo believes that 12 spaces would be enough.

Mr. Thornbury then asked about a statement on Mr. Vargo's application. Music was listed as a potential environmental impact. Mr. Thornbury asked Mr. Vargo to elaborate on that statement.

Mr. Vargo stated that with the zoning district and the railroad being 200' away, he can't imagine turning his speakers up louder than a train horn. When asked about outdoor speakers, Mr. Vargo stated that nothing would be outside.

Ms. Alberson asked Mr. Spring about any landscape requirements since the parking area will be changing.

Mr. Spring stated that there will be certain requirements for landscaping. The recommendation is written in a way that states that the parking area and landscaping will be done according to Code. Some landscape buffering won't be necessary since there is a significant grade change between where the parking would end and the street. One purpose of landscape buffering is to help to eliminate headlights on the street. At this location there is about a 4 to 5 foot drop from the street to the parking area. Planting a bush by the parking lot won't be high enough to reach up to the roadway. Therefore, this buffering won't be required.

Ms. Wall asked if anything was going to be built to the south of the building.

Mr. Spring stated that the area is a remnant of a lot that is owned by the City of Tipp City. It is adjacent to future Kyle Park Dr. and it is an unbuildable lot.

Ms. Wall followed up by asking if there is no concern about the setback to the south not being to Code.

Mr. Spring answered that there is no concern. The left and right side setbacks are less than 50 feet, but nothing would be built on these areas. The right, with a $\pm 1.2'$ is the tree line and the left was discussed above.

Ms. Wall asked if Mr. Vargo's business was currently located in Tipp City. He stated that no it was not. Currently, his business is attached to his home in Vandalia. Ms. Wall then welcomed him to town.

Mr. Thornbury stated that the proposal was very thorough. Ms. Wall also stated that the Staff Report, which was not read in its entirety,

was very thorough.

Mr. Thornbury moved to forward a positive recommendation to City Council regarding a Special Use Permit (with conditions) for the proposed establishment of Commercial Recreation Facilities (Indoors) at the existing structure located at 475 S. First Street. Ms. DeSantis seconded the motion. Motion passed 4-0.

**Set Public Hearing:
Brian Land – 10 E.
Walnut – Zoning
Code & Map
Amendment**

No staff report this evening, since only setting Public Hearing. Public Hearing is scheduled for Tuesday, October 13, 2015 at 7:30pm.

Ms. Wall asked if there were any objections. With none, the Public Hearing was set.

**5-year Capital
Improvement Plan
Presentation**

City Manager Tim Eggleston was in attendance to present the 5-year Capital Improvement Plan.

Current predictions for 2016, show 2.9 million in revenue and 2.8 million in expenditures. So, there could possibly be a \$90,000 carry-over. However, there are times that money is needed to cover some project costs that are unexpected.

Projects are being bid out a little earlier now in hopes of getting on the docket for contractors before they pick up other work.

Staff is carrying through with the 10-year Capital Improvement Plan laid out by the Advisory Committee.

Next year, the City of Tipp City will be investing, approximately, \$540,000 in street reconstruction throughout the city. Water and sanitary sewer lines are being improved at the cost of about \$426,000. Staff is currently rebidding the Roslyn subdivision to upgrade the 4 inch water line to an 8 inch line. Sanitary sewer will also be upgraded with this project. The estimated cost for these upgrades will be approximately \$1.2 million.

Staff is being asked to evaluate their vehicles and equipment on a yearly basis to determine whether or not these items can go another year before having to be replaced.

Substation 1 will be in the design phase next year with an estimated cost of \$186,000. Construction costs in 2017 are expected to be \$5 million.

Staff is working diligently to prioritize projects based on the conditions of a particular area, such as the streets, and the overall needs of the community. Furthermore, the community needs to be thanked for supporting the levy. City Council is dedicating 2% of the 1% income tax towards CIP. So there is a good base for critically needed infrastructure improvements. It is truly forward thinking to recognize the need and value of maintaining the infrastructure of the community.

September 28th at 3:00pm is the City Council Work Session on the Capital Improvement programs.

It is really nice to be in a community that is working hard to keep the infrastructure up-to-date. It is unheard of with the way that the state is cutting back funding.

Mr. Eggleston stated that he or Mr. John Green, City of Tipp City Finance Director, would be available for any questions.

Ms. Wall asked how old the Tipp City Government Center building is.

Mr. Green stated that he believed that our offices moved in around 1990. The Police Department building is a little newer.

Ms. Wall expressed that the building appears to be in pretty good condition, so major replacements like the HVAC system made her wonder how old the building is.

Mr. Eggleston then specified that a lot of the HVAC system was updated or replaced this year. The next step is windows and those types of items to keep up with energy efficiency.

Further, Ms. Wall stated that the 5-year plan includes in 2018, 2019, and 2020, updates to the HVAC for the Tipp City Government Center. Each year has substantial price tags. What is that for exactly?

Mr. Green answered that in the past, not all units were replaced at once. For instance, the Police Department building has 10 individual units that were scheduled to be replaced over time. Due to some hail damage, the city's insurance company picked up a majority of the cost, so all units were replaced in one year. The plan is to do the same thing on the Government Center side. Half of the units are scheduled to be replaced one year and the other half the next year. The units will be evaluated first to determine if, in fact, they need to be replaced at the time. Mr. Green did confirm that it was 1990 when the building was completed, so in 2018, 2019, and 2020, the HVAC units will be nearly 30 years old and in need of replacement.

Ms. Wall stated that she doesn't believe the city has one person that is responsible for writing grants. With that being said, she asked if each department is responsible for seeking out grant money.

Mr. Green explained that Brad Vath, Assistant City Manager and Economic Development Director for the City of Tipp City, does the majority of grant writing and research. Although, each department head is often aware of grants available for their specific area. For instance, Jim Asher (Parks Department), Eric Burris (Police Department), Steve Kessler (Fire Department), and Mark Senseman (EMS) have all been active in searching for grants that would be beneficial for their departments.

Ms. Wall inquired if the amount of grant money is going up each year. With the state cutting funding, money must come from other sources.

Mr. Eggleston stated that for the Streets Department, the OPWC

grants are the ones that are most available. The city typically has to come up with \$50,000-\$100,000 depending on how much money is requested. For bigger projects, like CR 25A, federal money from MVRPC was available.

Ms. Alberson requested additional information regarding items that are more Planning related. The items include, public restrooms in the downtown area, the interstate design plan, and the parks and open spaces master plan.

Mr. Eggleston explained that City Council will discuss these items. A decision will be made whether or not to turn the old City Hall building into a public restroom area. The interstate design plan is in place to hopefully draw attention to Tipp City as you are traveling up the interstate.

Mr. Green followed up by stating that a study will be done to map out a beautification plan for the exit off of I-75. The hope is to have an exit similar to what is seen in other cities. It appears that ODOT does not always mow the exit area. Part of the issue is getting to the area and the elevation. There has been quite a bit of talk in City Council Planning Sessions regarding making the interchanges more appealing.

Ms. Alberson followed up by asking what the \$20,000 that is allocated will be used for specifically.

Mr. Green answered that the \$20,000 will be used for planning and design. It all depends what the planner envisions for the area.

Further, Mr. Green explained that the park and open spaces plan is outdated and needs updating. The plan is at least 12-15 years.

and for zoning Board

Ms. Wall commented that she has been in the Planning Board since 2005 and the interstate design plan has been discussed since that time. She is not sure how it gets priority.

Mr. Eggleston stated that streets typically take priority and then anything left over is then allocated to equipment.

Mr. Green followed up by commenting that when the 10-year plan was put together an advisory committee was formed to help. There were 5 major projects – aero-ladder, fire station expansion, reconstruction of Dow St. (2 phases), and S. Third St. The only way we picked up the downtown project was by front-loading all the projects while interest rates were low. The economy was just recovering at this time. Debt was borrowed to complete everything. The city has been cash poor, for lack of a better term, until 2016-2017. At that time the cash balance begins to improve. Major projects will be completed and the debt will be paid down. This is why other projects are working back into the budget for 2016.

Ms. Wall agrees with the comment that the vehicles need to be evaluated before being replaced. The reality is that they might not need to be replaced as often as they have been in the past. The list and cost is substantial.

Mr. Eggleston stated that often heavy equipment needs replaced much sooner. City staff does take great care of equipment and vehicles and work hard to keep items in great shape. The most "damage" that can be seen is paint peeling. Hopefully this will continue.

Ms. Wall asked if any Planning Board member would like to see an emphasis on any one project in the 5-year Capital Improvement Plan.

Ms. DeSantis stated that she would like to see an emphasis placed on the interstate design. This is something that she has heard from many other individuals through the years. The downtown is so great, but no one would know by looking at the exit.

Mr. Eggleston indicated that Eric Mack, Deputy Director for the City of Tipp City, and Matt Spring are working on entrance signage. Some items that were looked at previously have come in higher than the budget would allow.

Ms. DeSantis commented that other cities utilize different landscaping companies to mow the exit ramps. Often the companies rotate and donate their time. Plaques, listing the companies, are put on display.

Mr. Eggleston responded that it is amazing what other cities are allowed to do and others cannot. We have to cooperate with ODOT and get permission to work in the right-of-way area. It appears that they are relaxing on this issue, so maybe we can look into the possibility of having companies donate time to mow the area. It really would enhance the community.

Ms. Alberson agreed and stated that the exit ramp does not provide a positive impression.

Ms. Wall questioned when money would be budgeted to actually complete beautification. Currently, \$20,000 is allotted for design in 2016, but the work will be another amount of money. Is it cost dependent?

Mr. Eggleston explained that he believed it is a part of the 10-year plan of the advisory committee. If dollars are available it may be funded. Not sure if it could be done under the current 5-year Capital Improvement Plan. It could easily be a \$100,000 venture and then a maintenance plan would need to be put into place. At this time, it just needs to get designed and then we can move forward. There is a possibility of working some deals with some landscape companies to get some of the work completed.

Ms. Wall commented that the benefit of beautifying the interstate would outweigh the restrooms. There is almost \$93,000 allotted for restrooms. Could those funds be used for something else? Beautifying the interstate will actually bring people into the community. Exposing the community outweighs the restrooms and provides more for the money that will be spent. Although, restrooms are something that could definitely be used in the downtown area.

Mr. Eggleston stated that City Council might take that same opinion

when they review the study and determine what the cost will be to complete the project.

Old Business

Ms. Wall inquired about the status of Board Member Mo Eichman.

Mr. Spring stated that Mr. Eichman did complete his tenure with the City of Tipp City in the last few weeks. He is on vacation now. It is Mr. Spring's belief that Mr. Eichman is considering permanently resigning from the Planning Board. Once that decision has been made, a motion will go through City Council and back to the Planning Board. Mr. Spring will keep everyone informed.

Miscellaneous

City Council Reports – August 17, 2015

Ms. Alberson attended the meeting and reported that there were a couple of items that had been seen previously by the Planning Board. One was the zoning code amendment regarding the Highway Business on 25A. There were no real comments or concerns from the City Council. The other item was the modification to allow for Fraternal, Charitable, and Service Oriented Clubs – Tipp City Seniors. City Council provided support for that item.

Upcoming City Council Meetings – September 21, 2015

Ms. Wall will attend the September 21, 2015 City Council Meeting.

October 5, 2015

Mr. Thornbury will attend the October 5, 2015 City Council Meeting.

Board Member Comments

Ms. Wall had one further comment. The Planning Board spends a lot of time on aesthetics. The goal is to improve the city's entry ways and other parts of the city in any way that we can. It also needs to be remembered that we need to upkeep what we do have. The shopping plaza, where CVS and the grocery store is located, is off our entry way and is in terrible condition. A lot of money was spent on the street scape and it is lovely. Unfortunately, as soon as you pull off the street it is awful. The area by the Burger King is not marked clearly and it is surprising that there has not been a number of accidents. Further, the parking lot needs paved badly. It is not city property, but isn't there a property maintenance code that can be enforced.

Ms. DeSantis agreed completely with Ms. Wall's comments.

Ms. Alberson questioned who is supposed to maintain the landscape work that was completed through the street scape project. Some is maintained very well and others not as much.

Mr. Spring stated that the property owners are to maintain that particular landscape.

Adjournment

Ms. DeSantis **moved the meeting be adjourned**. Ms. Alberson seconded the motion. Ms. Wall declared the meeting adjourned at 8:28 pm.

Stacy m. Wall
Stacy Wall, Planning Board Chairman

Attest: Kelly R. Rowlands
Kelly Rowlands, Board Secretary