

MINUTES  
VILLAGE OF SUNBURY  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION  
APRIL 27, 2020

Mayor Tommy Hatfield called the Sunbury Planning and Zoning meeting to order at 6:30 p.m., on April 27, 2020, in a virtual format with proceedings streamed to the public, with a moment of silent prayer and the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Greg Elliott was sworn in as a member of the Planning and Zoning Commission by Mr. Brehm.

Those answering roll call: Tommy Hatfield, Joe St. John, John Lieurance, Joe Gochenour and Greg Elliott. Mr. Ryba joined immediately after roll call and was present.

Also present - Dave Parkinson, David Brehm Allen Rothermel and Steve Pyles

**Preliminary Major Subdivision Plan and Plat Review** - Rockford Homes has submitted a preliminary plat for the Rolling Hills Subdivision. This is a Planned Residential Development of 150 single family homes on 67.58 acres of the land formally occupied by the Sunbury Golf Course. The PRD rezoning was approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission during the December 2019 meeting and in February 2020 by Sunbury Council.

Mr. Theuerkauf from Rockford Homes represented the applicant and presented the proposed subdivision plan and plat. Their intention, if approved, is to begin construction design with intent to begin construction in the Spring of 2021 in three phases, with phase 1 being the NW quadrant of the property.

Mr. Parkinson gave the staff report noting the plan and plat reflects the development plan that was presented during the rezoning of the property. He additionally noted that drainage management will be a discussion item between engineers as the plan is refined during the construction drawings phase, and that some minor relocation of planned paths to connect with future development of the Price Ponds will need to be coordinated.

Mayor Hatfield covered a brief history of the property and then requested staff review future steps in the development project.

Engineer Parkinson noted that the schedule of the applicant, with construction starting in Spring of 2021 should coincide properly with trunk sewer installation. He continued by stating that approval of the preliminary plat allows for construction design, which is

much more detailed and time and resources intensive. Construction plans are approved by the Sunbury Engineer and Sunbury Council. Final plat can be parallel to construction plans and is approved by Planning and Zoning and Council after approval of construction plans.

Mayor Hartfield requested comments from the Commission.

Mr. St. John had a question about revised plans recently uploaded to the OneDrive. He noted the addition of a trail to complete a loop around one pond and a new trail encompassing another pond. Mr. Pyles replied that these were updated plans received today related to the staff review by Engineer Parkinson, Mr. Dennison, engineer for the applicant, added that they were updates to plans based upon the Sunbury review and that the date of the plans was simply missed, but they are revisions to respond to comments from Mr. Parkinson on drainage and the trails.

Mr. Gochenour requested clarification of the trails. Engineer Parkinson replied that trails to encompass two ponds and to connect to an active recreation area were added in this revision to reflect comments from the Commission during the rezoning process.

Mr. St. John reported he did not have any additional feedback.

Mayor Hatfield requested other questions or comments, there were none.

Motion by Mr. St. John to approve the subdivision plan and preliminary plat, second by Mr. Ryba. The motion passed with 6 ayes.

Mr. Brehm noted that Sunbury is working on the trunk sewer that will service this project and that will be crucial to the construction plans and final plat approvals. It was his desire to have that statement as part of the record related to this subdivision plan and preliminary plat approval.

**Major Site Plan and Building** - Elter Building Systems has submitted an application for the construction of an additional 12,000 sf.. trailer manufacturing and warehouse building on behalf of Gerling and Associates. The proposed location is 200 Kintner Parkway.

Mr. Elter and Mr. Elmasian were present to represent the property owner. Mr. Elter provided a brief history of the property and the sequence of buildings constructed and planned as future construction. He stated they wanted to build additional building space in phases, starting with the proposed building. The owners have grown their broadcast trailer business selling nine of ten in the U.S. and need more space. The first building would be 5 bays, 80'x150', and they would like to be enclosed by this winter.

Mr. Gochenour asked about plans for screening for the residential community to the east of the site.

Response was that a wood fence was under consideration. Mr. Elter added the owners would like to have security fencing and then screen with natural materials such as trees and bushes.

Mayor Hatfield requested that Engineer Parkinson discuss his review. Mr. Parkinson presented his review, noting that there are questions about the capacity of the retention basin and the ability to serve the existing buildings, parking and the proposed building. He also noted that his impression is the applicant is seeking approval for the entire plan, which encompasses two new buildings and then extensions of those two buildings. He added that the zoning code has changed since the previous buildings were constructed and that it is more comprehensive, including language related to lighting, loading areas and parking. He clarified that his review did not note that a mound was prohibited but rather that the mound would not properly fit with slopes that could be maintained. He also added that there were elements missing related to curbing, screening from the right of way (if the Commission was inclined to require it given the layout of current buildings and distance from the right of way), that there was more information needed on storm water management and a proposed ditch.

Engineer Parkinson also remarked that the process for a commercial or industrial site is different than a subdivision and that commercial or industrial site plans should be fully engineered to address his previous comments for approval.

Mayor Hatfield thanked Engineer Parkinson noting that the code has changed and that it is a balance for new construction in that area, being reasonable and recognizing existing conditions. He then asked for additional questions from the Commission.

Mr. St. John asked for clarification on setbacks. Mr. Parkinson indicated that code is 30' but there are requirements for landscaping and buffering and more could be done to hide buildings from neighboring properties including residences. Mr. St. John said the idea of a chain link fence was concerning and mentioned that SHOWA, a neighboring property, had larger mounds and buffering.

Mayor Hatfield asked for clarification from the applicant as to if they were proposing two buildings and extensions or just a 12,000 S.F. new building. Mr. Elter replied that the storm drainage needs to account for the entire plan but they were asking for the construction of a 12,000 S.F. building. He stated the first building is not as worrisome as two buildings and extensions as that would need discussions of buffering.

Mr. Elliott asked that with the proximity to a residential area is sound an issue? Mr. Elter replied that the business has been there for years, there is some bending and welding that happens in one of the front buildings, but he has not noticed a sound issue.

Mr. Elter added that they are not seeking approval for the entire plan, the current desire is to get the first building approved for construction.

Mayor Hatfield asked for specific comments from the Commission for the construction of building #1. Engineer Parkinson replied that without building #2 there is room for buffering but it could impact the second building, if they are seeking both buildings there are some problems to be solved. He added his comments pertaining to code requirements are relevant no matter how many buildings are being built.

Mr. Brehm concurred, he stated one building may allow focus but there are still code requirements to be met. He mentioned that SHOWA is a building built after code changes and that it is a good model of buffering and provided his thoughts on buffering, the code and timeframes related to a phased plan of buildings, approval would be for construction within the code timeframe.

Mr Elter again stated they are seeking approval to build the first building, but had presented a site plan that showed what might happen in the future.

Mr. Gochenour commented that the applicant may want to consider expansion of parking in phases to move the building to the west and provide more buffering to the east. He also asked if the applicant had an intention to relocate from other plants to the new building. Mr. Elter responded that they were trying to allow for future construction and not install and remove parking and there were no plans to close any other buildings as they are growing.

Mr. Elmasian commented that they want to plan for all buildings, are there other concerns?

Mayor Hatfield responded that adding buildings in that area is changing the current setback and the Commission is trying to take the adjoining residences into account. Setbacks were further discussed, including mounding, fencing, and landscaping. Existing vegetation and structures on the residential property were also discussed.

The applicant will take the discussion and comments into consideration for revisions.

Mr. Brehm stated the application is not developed sufficiently for approval. There was a discussion of application decision deadlines. Mr. Brehm asked the applicant if they are seeking approval tonight or agree to delay resolving concerns addressed. Mr. Elter stated they will do the additional engineering necessary for approval. Mr. Brehm stated the two alternatives are to not approve based upon the Sunbury Engineer's report, or table to resolve concerns raised. Mr. Elter agreed to table.

Mr. Parkinson raised there were other issues in his report that the applicant may benefit from comments from the Commission, including curbing.

There was also a code discussion and interpretation of the building materials portion of the code and visibility from public streets and adjoining residential properties.

There was a motion to table the application by Mr. St. John, second by Mr. Gochenour. Motion passed with six ayes.

### **Informal Presentation – Price Ponds Rezoning and Planned Residential Development**

Mr. Jim Ohlin introduced his team; Mr. Gary Smith, with Ms. Radcliff and Mr. Denniston. Mr. Smith introduced this project, he noted they have been refining and improving the plan and will submit for the next Commission meeting. He provided some background to the development's previous submittal and plan improvements they will be proposing. They have increased the percentage of lots backing to open space, the lot number remains the same, but the wider lot count has increased slightly.

Mayor Hatfield gave some general comments and requested other comments or questions.

Mr. Gochenour stated he was pleased to see the preservation of the trees and woods, more open space and that trees were being preserved.

Mr. St. John mentioned road width, especially on the east/west connector, and if a smaller road could be accommodated to slow speeds and reduce maintenance costs. Mayor Hartfield concurred. Mr. Smith responded that they appreciate the comment and will take that comment into account if possible.

Mayor Hatfield also requested consideration of intersection shapes to also calm speed levels.

Mr. Elliott asked about walking paths. Mr. Smith said the original plan had extensive walking paths and they were retained. He then drew the various paths on the plan to illustrate pedestrian/bike paths. Mr. Elliott also asked if the water features on the plan were designed to retain or detain water. Mr. Smith replied they are designed for storm water but will act as a pond and retain water.

Mr. St. John asked if the woods are being retained and deeded. The plan remains the same in that regard.

Mr. Parkinson asked about a gravel path circulating in the woods. Mr. Smith responded it is not being retained for concern of disturbing the trees. Applicant is open to discussion. There was also a discussion to provide connectivity between Rolling Hills through this development and on to the schools.

Mayor Hatfield asked for other comments or questions. Mr. Parkinson made a comment regarding the alignment of the road at Cheshire and Golf Course Road, he would like to see some right of way preserved in the event a connection or roundabout was constructed in the future.

The informal presentation was concluded as there were no further comments or questions.

No visitors chose to address the commission.

Minutes from the February 24, 2020 were reviewed. Motion by Mayor Hatfield to approve, second by Mr. Ryba. There were no comments, corrections or additions. The minutes were approved with six ayes.

Mr. Pyles reviewed the Zoning Report.

New Business – Mayor Hatfield welcomed and thanked Mr. Elliott for serving on the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Next Meeting – Mr. St John moved that the May meeting be moved to June 1, 2020 to avoid the Memorial Day holiday, second by Mr. Lieurance. Motion passed with six ayes.

Motion to adjourn was by Mr. Gochenour, second by Mr. Ryba, six ayes, meeting adjourned.