

June 21, 2019



Memorandum for the Planning Board

Subject: Public Meeting on June 27, 2019

City of Bellbrook
15 East Franklin Street
Bellbrook, Ohio 45305

T (937) 848-4666
F (937) 848-5190

www.cityofbellbrook.org

This is to confirm that the Planning Board will conduct a public meeting on **June 27, 2019** at **6:00 PM** to review a proposed amendment to section 18.20.B(7)(b) temporary signage in the Old Village, Discussion of lighting of signs in the Old Village, Subdivision regulations discussion, and gantt chart review. Please find enclosed an agenda for the meeting, the minutes to approve from April 11, 2019, and case materials.

Please let me know if you have any questions on this material.

Sincerely,

Jeff Green
Planning and Zoning Assistant



Planning Board Meeting
July 11, 2019, 6:00 pm
Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Roll call
3. Approval of prior minutes of April 11, 2019
4. Old Business:
5. New Business:
 - Amendment to section 18.20.B(7)(b) Temporary Signage in the Old Village
 - Discussion on Internally Illuminated Sign Restrictions in the Old Village
 - Discussion on Subdivision Regulations
 - Gantt Chart Discussion (comp plan goal prioritization/timeframe)
6. Open Discussion
7. Adjournment



BELLBROOK PLANNING BOARD
PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES
April 11, 2019

PRESENT: Mr. Mitch Thompson
Mr. Ed Stangel – arrived 6:04
Mr. Brady Harding
Mr. Denny Bennett
Chairman Van Veldhuizen

GUEST: Mr. Bill Schieman
Charles Dynes
Darryl McGill

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Van Veldhuizen called the meeting of the Planning Board to order at 6:00 PM.

FORMAL APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman Van Veldhuizen requested a motion regarding the prior minutes of February 28, 2019. Mr. Bennett moved to approve the prior minutes; Mr. Thompson seconded the motion. Roll was called. Mr. Bennett, yes; Mr. Thompson, yes; Mr. Stangel, abstain; Mr. Harding, yes; Chairman Van Veldhuizen, yes. The motion carried 4-0; the minutes stand approved.

OLD BUSINESS

Mr. Bennett made a motion to move the flood plain item from New Business to the end of Old Business since some of the other items from New Business will affect this discussion. Mr. Harding seconded the motion. The Clerk called the roll. Mr. Bennett, yes; Mr. Harding, yes; Mr. Thompson, yes; Mr. Van Veldhuizen, yes. The motion passed 4-0.

NEW BUSINESS

- **Lot Consolidation of Lots 185 and 186 of Winter Haven Block "F" Subdivision**

Mr. Green reported that the owner of 4378 Bellemeade Drive has submitted a request to consolidate his lot with the lot that he also owns beside it in order to put an addition onto the eastern side of the house. He added that the Winter Haven subdivision largely would be considered a legal nonconformity due to the minimum lot requirements. If this lot consolidation is approved, it would meet the minimum lot requirements of the R-1B zoning district as the current zoning regulations require.

- **Process for Bringing Proposed Zoning Code Changes Before the Board**

Mr. Green explained that as he is looking through the Bellbrook Zoning Code he is discovering items that should be added or changed. He asked the Board how they would like these items be presented to them.

Dr. Van Veldhuizen opined that simple changes could be brought before the board as they are discovered. A larger more inclusive review of codes could take place semiannually.

Mr. Green added that he has already found several things in the five weeks he has been in the position. Mr. Harding commented that reviewing these issues at least semiannually otherwise it could be a lot. Mr. Green agreed and stated that reviewing any more than six to eight codes could get overwhelming.

Mr. Thompson asked how the Comprehensive Plan effects the City's ordinances. Mr. Green answered that the plan has brought several needed changes to light. Mr. Thompson opined that the priority should be changes that are discovered as pertaining to the Comprehensive Plan.

Chairman Van Veldhuizen stated that review of the Comprehensive Plan and of existing ordinances should be combined to create the most effective meetings possible.

- **Proposed Changes to the Central Business District Requirements**

City Manager Dodd explained that the majority of the Comprehensive Plan was concerned with the downtown area. She showed the Board a map she had created that categorized the types of buildings in the central business district. The five categories she identified are retail, single family home, service, restaurant, and government/church. Although Mrs. Dodd stated that she knew our city is service heavy, she didn't realize how much until she made this visual representation. Services make up 45% of the downtown space. She admitted that she doesn't know if there is a magic number, but an active downtown would have a mix of retail/restaurants/services that encourage people to visit and stay a while. Our zoning currently has allowed our current situation. This illustrates a need for changes to our zoning policies.

Mr. Bennett asked for clarification on what types of businesses were counted as service. Mrs. Dodd answered that insurance agencies, realtors, lawyers, pet groomers, funeral homes, and hair salons all fall into the service category. Mr. Bennett asked if that was necessarily bad. The City Manager replied that the percentage is not ideal. If someone walks from one end of the district to the other, there are not very many businesses that you would just wander into. The core of an active downtown is businesses that entice people to stop and stay.

City Manager Dodd opined that one possible solution is to create an overlay district where we would have different requirements. Mr. Shoemaker, from Greene County Regional Planning stated that the city could limit the percentage of each type of business along the main corridor.

Mr. Thompson added that his hometown went through something like this. He opined that other cities and Heritage Ohio will provide us with some tips.

Mr. Bennett agreed. He also said he is surprised that Zetland Street is still empty.

Mr. Stangel stated that he would hate for us to turn down interested businesses just because they are service related. But he agrees that the city needs more retail and restaurants to make it more walkable.

Mr. Bennett joked that maybe we will get a dog groomer/craft beer business. The rest of the board agreed.

- **Flood Plain Discussion**

Mr. Bill Schieman, 3971 La Bonne Court, Beavercreek, stated that he is attending this meeting as he said he would last meeting. He brought more information about ways to handle flood plain zoning. First he wanted to correct one of his comments from last month's minutes. He said that Beavercreek had a no-fill zoning code. But it is actually the Township's zoning regulation that doesn't allow fill. They do that by considering fill as a conditional use.

Mr. Schieman brought copies of the zoning regulations from Beavercreek Township and Xenia Township. He also requested that Sugarcreek Township forward to Mr. Green the compensatory storage regulation that was drafted and approved by their Zoning Board. It has not been implemented by the Trustees to date. Mr. Schieman opined that it has not been approved because they do business with a company that is using the flood plain. He offered to share more of his opinions if anyone wanted to ask him.

Mr. Schieman referred to the Xenia Township compensatory storage requirement. This document is shorter than Sugarcreek Township's since Sugarcreek tried to take into account the parks and the sod farm. Xenia's is more streamlined.

Mr. Schieman explained that Bellbrook has three choices; do nothing which does not protect the flood plain at all, implement some kind of no-fill or no-fill with conditions, or implement some kind of compensatory storage regulation. He opined that any change Bellbrook makes to its ordinances will be viewed negatively by developers.

Mr. Schieman said that Bellbrook has a big piece of flood plain left and we need to decide what we are going to do about it. Most of the rest of it has already been developed. There is not much outside of the regulatory flood way. Flood plains have two pieces: regulatory flood way, and floodway fringe which used to be called 100 year flood plain (1%). FEMA draws the insurance maps. Several homes in the City are in that 100 year flood plain. Federal flood insurance is mandatory for every house that has a mortgage in this area. There is also a 500 year flood plain and the lender may require flood insurance.



To: Planning Board
From: Jeff Green, Planning and Zoning Assistant
Date: July 11, 2019
Subject: Staff Report for Changes to the Zoning Code

Summary of the Request

The request is to amend section 18.20.B(7)(b) of the Bellbrook Zoning Code. The request would remove VRB review for temporary signage in the Old Village District.

Applicant Information

City Staff

Current Zoning District

Not Applicable

Parcel Identification

Not Applicable

Additional Actions or Next Steps to be taken by the City

The Planning Board would need to recommend the proposed changes to City Council for their review and approval.

Applicant's Reason for the Request

City staff has observed that currently, any temporary sign in the Old Village District requires VRB approval. A temporary sign can be placed in the Old Village for 30 days per quarter after the Village Review Board grants approval.

If a temporary sign permit is applied for, approval can sometimes take 1 month or more, as the VRB must approve the sign in a public meeting. Staff believes that a temporary sign does not significantly alter the Old Village appearance being temporary in nature meaning the impact of such a change (if approved) would be minor at best.

Staff has reviewed code from the City of Dayton and the City of Centerville to determine what

Soil Survey Data

Not Applicable

Classification of Streets, Traffic Volumes & Direction, Planned Improvements

Not Applicable

Flood Plain Information

Not Applicable

Comments from City and County Agencies

Not Applicable

Supporting Documents, Maps & Graphics

See below for code comparisons for nearby cities:

City of Dayton

150.345.14 SIGNS.

Short-term or temporary signs are permitted and no Certificate of Appropriateness is required, provided, they are only displayed for a maximum of seven consecutive days in each 90 day period, have a maximum size of 20 inches by 30 inches and only one such sign may be displayed. Wall murals shall not be considered short-term or temporary signs. (Ord. 30515-05, passed 12-28-05; amend Ord. 31490-16, passed 5-04-16)

Certificate of Appropriateness only required after a certain time frame

City of Centerville

J. Signs Permitted for the Architectural Preservation District (APD)

1. Approvals Required (APD)

The Board of Architectural Review (BAR) may approve the erection, construction, location, or alteration (including repainting) of all permanent signs in the Architectural Preservation District (APD) in accordance to the provisions contained in the Special Approvals Section (Section 31) of this Zoning Ordinance.

Review only needed for Permanent Signs

Staff Recommendation

Staff would recommend approval as the proposed change would not significantly alter the intent of the Old Village and would help to streamline approval.

Article 18.B(7)(b) – Temporary Signs (Current)

18.20.B(7)(b) Temporary: Temporary signs of various types and designs for businesses and public notice shall be allowed provided they are approved by the Village Review Board and are limited to a total of thirty (30) days display time per quarter.

Article 18.B(7)(b) – Temporary Signs (Proposed)

(b) Temporary: Temporary signs of various types and designs for businesses and public notice shall be allowed ~~provided they are approved by the Village Review Board~~ but are limited to a total of thirty (30) days display time per quarter.