April 5, 2019

Memorandum for the Planning Board

Subject: Public Meeting on April 11, 2019

This is to confirm that the Planning Board will conduct a public meeting on April 11, 2019 at 6:00 PM to review a proposed replat and discuss compensatory storage (flood plain regulations), process for updating the code/comprehensive plan, and downtown use composition. Please find enclosed an agenda for the meeting, the minutes to approve from February 28, 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
April 11, 2019, 6:00 pm
Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Roll call
3. Approval of prior minutes of February 28, 2019
4. Old Business:
   • Flood plain policy discussion
5. New Business:
   • Lot Consolidation for Lots 185-186 – Winter Haven Block “F”
   • Procedure for updating Comprehensive Plan
   • Process for bringing proposed zoning code changes before the board
   • Discussion on changes to central business district requirements
6. Open Discussion
7. Adjournment
CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Van Veldhuizen called the meeting of the Planning Board to order at 6:03 PM.

FORMAL APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman Van Veldhuizen requested a motion regarding the prior minutes of January 31, 2019. Mr. Bennett moved to approve the prior minutes; Mr. Stangel seconded the motion. Roll was called. Mr. Bennett, yes; Mr. Stangel, yes; Mr. Harding, yes; Chairman Van Veldhuizen, yes. The motion carried 3-0; the minutes stand approved.

PUBLIC HEARING

OLD BUSINESS

- Comprehensive Plan Presentation by Devon Shoemaker, Executive Director, Miami Valley Regional Planning and Coordinating Commission of Greene County, Ohio
Chairman Van Veldhuizen explained that the Planning Board was meeting to discuss the Comprehensive Plan after having a month to review it. The goal is to decide if the Plan is ready to be recommended to City Council. He stated that other than a few grammar and spelling items the plan looked very good.

Mr. Bill Schieman, 3971 La Bonne Court, Beavercreek, stated that he is on the board of the Little Miami Watershed Network (LMWN). Mr. Schieman did a search of the Comprehensive Plan for the word “flood” and was shocked to see only two instances of the word. One of the instances is on page 49 that shows a Special Flood Hazard Area in Magee Park. In his opinion no community in Greene County is at greater risk than Bellbrook. He opined that in a city so affected by flooding, he expected more attention be paid to the subject. There are more than 50 homes in the special flood hazard area. Even with the updated FEMA maps these homes have a 26% chance of flooding of 1 to 3 feet over the life of a 30-year mortgage. Mr. Schieman explained that the old designation of 100-year flood plains no longer exists. Weather pattern changes have seen ever increasing rainfall amounts. Bellbrook is at the bottom of a funnel. Water from Beavercreek, Centerville, and Kettering all flow this way. Mr. Schieman stated that he believes the lack of recognition is a mistake. He relayed that he and Mrs. Hope Taft met with the City Manager last week to share their concern. The LMWN wants this addressed in the Comprehensive Plan. He asked how this was overlooked by the City and planners.

Mr. Bennet asked what Mr. Schieman and Mrs. Taft would suggest be done. Mr. Schieman said he had hoped to hear thoughts from the Planning Board.

Mr. Van Veldhuizen asked what the LMWN wanted to see included, such as exclusionary zones.

Mr. Schieman said he believes that no fill should be allowed in the flood plain. The first recommendation is to recognize Bellbrook’s vulnerability. Even Spring Valley is at lower risk because of the levee. The extreme rain events are called “rain bombs” and last year we had four feet above the average rainfall. The 30-year trend is a steady increase. He said that the Planning Board can recommend zoning regulations like no fill or compensatory storage. This needs to involve developers to make sure there is no net loss of flood plain. Beavercreek has a no-fill regulation. The second recommendation is that Bellbrook network with its neighbors. Sugarcreek Township has a lot of flood plain that could hurt Bellbrook. Kettering and Centerville developments have made use of bio-swales and retention areas to keep the water in place.

Mr. Bennet opined that the weather patterns have been strange. He shared stories about the effect of heavy rain in Southern California he witnessed on a recent trip.

Carol Bennett, 2211 Shadowood Circle, said that she has seen the comprehensive plan and attended the Community Leaders Meeting and was impressed by the plan. She stated that she walks and runs throughout Bellbrook and is excited to see plans to make the city more
accessible. Mrs. Bennett asked that the board look at Miamisburg for inspiration. She reports that their city has contiguous buildings and plenty of places to sit. Miamisburg even uses the space between buildings adding lighting, benches, and plants. Mrs. Bennett said she wishes that the sidewalks and paths did not quit just past the Covenant Animal Clinic. She pointed out that the Centerville soccer parks include paved walking paths and that our city should consider this. She opined that garbage cans around the city could encourage residents not to litter. Mrs. Bennett is concerned with the debris that people allow to wash into the storm sewers. She also recommends that Bellbrook protect the waterways.

Mr. Michael Nettis, 3153 Spillway Drive wanted to add his commendation on a great comprehensive plan. He stated that he likes the form-based zoning, adding crosswalks, and the farmer’s market items. Mr. Nettis asked about improving the public spaces with toilets to encourage people to stay longer. He asked about plans to expand or annex land from Sugarcreek Township. He also proposed a joint economic agreement. He shared his thought that Bellbrook carefully consider the difference between historic significance versus something just being old. He likes the plan for downtown crosswalks but finds that many drivers do not stop for pedestrians. Mr. Nettis agreed that the need for parking be balanced with protection of greenspace. He asked what “developer engagement“ means in the future.

Mr. Bennett answered that 15 years ago a study was conducted concerning a merger with Sugarcreek Township. It was decided that Bellbrook not merge with Sugarcreek Township. There would need to be a new ballot item to look into a merger again.

Mrs. Elaine Middlestetter, 4065 Eckworth Drive, added that the merger study was proposed to keep Centerville from annexing the Cornerstone property. She opined that at the time a lot of misinformation was spread. The annexation would increase costs to the city due to the addition of a large amount of roads. The Township did not want Bellbrook to have zoning control.

Devon Shoemaker, 651 Dayton Xenia Road, is from the Regional Planning and Coordinating Commission. Mr. Shoemaker explained that the draft of the plan had not included detailed suggestions involving water and the flood plan. New pages have now been included along with specific goals to address this. He added that this is a regional issue and needs to be coordinated with Bellbrook’s neighbors. He added that cities like Centerville are addressing water in their new developments with bio-swales, rain gardens, flow-through planters, and permeable surfaces. These items cost more up front but can be done. The comprehensive plan is a base and the city can add to the plan.

Mr. Ed Stangel asked Mr. Schiemann where the 50 homes are that are in danger. Mr. Shoemaker answered that most of them are on the south end of the city.

Chairman Van Veldhuizen reminded the Planning Board that tonight’s goal was to decide if the plan was acceptable to recommend to City Council. The plan has been two years
in the making and does not want to unnecessarily impede the progress. He added that the plan should be regularly addressed and updated at least every couple of years or as needed.

City Manager Dodd recommended the approval of the plan with the additions including a new goal to address the flood plain issue. She suggested the board to meet again to propose specific flood plain policies.

Mr. Shoemaker recommended the city review the plan every three years. That is the time frame neighboring communities’ use.

Mr. Schieman expressed his hope that the board hold off on approving the plan until more specific flood plain language is included. He stated his belief that the addition Mr. Shoemaker brought is a good start but wants a firm recommendation. He opined that the long range plan needs to lay the foundations for actions and make specific recommendations like “no fill” or “compensatory storage” in all of the city’s flood plain. Mr. Schieman thinks the MVRPC document should state that a zoning ordinance be put in place as soon as possible. He would also like to see the document recommend working proactively on this with Sugarcreek Township.

Mr. Bennett added that he thinks Mr. Schieman and Mrs. Hope put together the language they want and send it to Mr. Shoemaker and Mrs. Dodd.

Mr. Schieman said he could do that, but it would just be wording. He said that a firm recommendation and concrete goals are lacking in the plan.

Chairman Van Veldhuizen explained that he does not believe a delay would be appropriate or useful. The Comprehensive Plan is meant to be a guideline. The board could meet to start working through specifics.

Mr. Shoemaker explained that the flood plain section is being added. He added that during all of the meetings, surveys, and discussions with leaders and residents of Bellbrook the flood plain issue was not mentioned. He apologized for missing this item.

Mrs. Hope Taft said she thinks the plan for downtown is good, but if you can’t get to downtown due to flooding it does not make a difference.

Mr. Schieman said he made notes during the meeting that he wanted to share: 1. Park maintenance: even though Bellbrook does not have a city tax, we share in the cost which have to be increasing due to increase in flood events. 2. City road maintenance money is being used for flood damage. 3. As far as branding, Bellbrook does not want to be known for flooding. 4. Working with Sugarcreek Township is vital since they have hundreds of acres of flood plain upstream of Bellbrook. A teamwork approach is needed because Bellbrook does not want them adding fill here and there.
Mr. Thompson added that the new addition states, “all Bellbrook can do is, do its part.”

Mr. Schieman said he thought that language was not strong enough. He opined his wish that the city be proactive.

Mrs. Dodd explained that any changes to language would have to be discussed and voted on at an open meeting or the Board could approve what was presented at this meeting. She said the Planning Board could approve the plan with the flood plain wording Mr. Shoemaker brought to the meeting and with a goal added concerning flood plain regulations. A review in a year would be a good idea.

The board members agreed with this plan.

A motion was made by Mr. Thompson to approve to send the Comprehensive Plan to City Council with the flood plain additions and goal and that the Planning Board meet in a month to look at flood plain recommendations. Mr. Bennett seconded the motion. The Clerk called the roll. Mr. Thompson, yes; Mr. Bennett, yes; Mr. Stangel, yes; Mr. Van Veldhuizen, yes. The motion passed 4-0.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Thompson recommended the Board meet in a month to discuss flood plain issues.

Mr. Stangel announced that on May 15 and 17 the High School at the Miami Valley South Stadium will be hosting the Division I District Track Meet. This is a big event for Bellbrook. This meet was traditionally held at Welcome Stadium. He opined that maybe Bellbrook can work to make this a successful event.

Mike Sabin, BellHop Café, wanted to thank the Planning Board for their dedication to the Comprehensive Plan. He added that the City Manager is doing a great job with public relations and should continue to publicize the Plan. This is exciting and there are things that can be put into action now. Infrastructure improvements and economic development are creating a vibrant community.

Hope Taft announced that there is a bill in the House to make April Native Plant month. She expressed her desire for the city to encourage the use of native plants to protect our land and water. She described a video by the Ohio EPA which explains low-impact construction.

Carolyn Destefani, Sugarcreek Township Trustee, explained how the Township is about to start its three-year review of the long-range plan. When talking about flood plain issues, the Trustees spoke with Bob Geyer, Greene County Engineer. The Trustees are looking at the flood plain and bike path plans. She said they are looking at possible plans to raise 725 out of the
flood plain by the Washington Mill Bridge. The project will have to be coordinated with the park. This would give bike access if Spring Valley would connect with it.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Bennett moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:10 PM and was seconded by Mr. Stangel.

_____________________________
David Van Veldhuizen, Chairman

Date

_____________________________
Pamela Timmons, Secretary

Date
To: Planning Board  
From: Jeff Green, Planning and Zoning Assistant  
Date: April 5, 2019  
Subject: Staff Report for Lot Combination (Lots 185 & 186 – Winter Haven Subdivision)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Summary of the Request</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The engineer representing the property owner has submitted a request to combine Lots 185 and 186 of Winter Haven Block “F” Subdivision. The subject property has an address of 4378 Bellemead Dr. with the property directly to the east (the lot to be consolidated) is currently vacant land. This action is a replat of Block F of the Winter Haven Subdivision which was originally approved in May 1963. The action being presented before you is to either approve or deny the lot combination request.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Applicant Information</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Engineer: Wayne Boutwell  
Prism Surveys, LLC  
5184 Fairground  
Xenia, Ohio 45385  
Owner: Charles Dynes  
4378 Bellemead Dr  
Bellbrook, Ohio 45305 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Current Zoning District</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-1B One-Family Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Parcel Identification</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Parcel ID # L35000200130008600, 0.27 Acres  
Parcel ID # L35000200130008500, 0.29 Acres |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Additional Actions or Next Steps to be taken by the City</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If a replat is approved by the Planning Board, the next step would be for City Council to either</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
approve or deny the Planning Board’s recommendation. If a replat is denied, the property owners can submit revisions to the Planning Board to be considered at another meeting. The Municipal Code does not provide any appeal procedure.

**Applicant’s Reason for the Request**

The applicant would like to consolidate their two properties for the purpose of a building addition on the eastern edge of the property. As the existing house is roughly 5 ft. from the side property line, any further addition would require a variance unless a lot consolidation was to occur. It should be noted that the Winter Haven subdivision largely would be considered a legal nonconformity due to the minimum lot requirements. If this lot were to be approved, it would meet the minimum lot requirements of the R-1B zoning district.

**Surrounding Land Use within 1,000 Feet**

The land surrounding the subject property is mostly single family residential; however there is multi-family residential and Planned Commercial to the north and northwest. It should be noted there is a single O-1 zoned property to the west, however it is vacant land at this time.

![Map Image](image-url)

**Previous Related Development Decisions in the Immediate Area (3-5 Years)**

None

**Comprehensive Plan Applied to the Geographical Area**
These parcels were originally platted in 1963 as part of the Winter Haven Subdivision Block “F”. The 2019 Comprehensive Plan addresses residential housing in relation to this property. Specifically, the Plan wants this (and the surrounding area) to be “neighborhood residential.” Per the Plan, Bellbrook should seek to preserve single-family residential subdivisions when possible:

“Bellbrook should protect its single-family residential platted lands or town lots (subdivisions) for that purpose and consider multi-family units on unplatted lands. Single-family Development, multi-family, and duplexes should all be considered on vacant lands but not part of a subdivision. During the public input phase it was clear that the citizens of Bellbrook want to remain small and retain and maintain its suburban residential neighborhoods.”

In summary, the request would seem to fit the goal of the Comprehensive Plan, to protect the area and keep it as neighborhood residential.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Public Utilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone/Cable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Survey Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification of Streets, Traffic Volumes &amp; Direction, Planned Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor streets with 50’ or more of right-of-way on each side</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flood Plain Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The rear 15’ of this property resides in the floodplain due to the creak running through the rear of the property.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments from City and County Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Engineer: The City Engineer approves of the record plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Agencies: NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Supporting Maps &amp; Graphics                                               |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Replat and Aerial Enclosed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff Recommendation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff recommends the proposed lot consolidation be approved as this request would meet the goal of the comprehensive plan, while also further bringing it further in line with the lot requirements of the R-1B zoning district.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This map was prepared as the tax map for Greene County as prepared by the Greene County Engineer in accordance with Section 5713.09 of the Ohio Revised Code. Greene County assumes no legal responsibility for the information contained on this map. Users noting errors or omissions are encouraged to contact the Greene County GIS Department.

Created On: 4/4/2019

1 inch = 60 feet
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov/Church</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ARTICLE 12

B-4 CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT

12.01

INTENT:

This district is designed to provide for a restricted variety of retail stores and related activities and for office buildings and service establishments which occupy the prime retail frontage in the Central Business District, and which serve the comparison, convenience and service needs of a consumer population well beyond the corporate boundaries of the Municipality. The district regulations are also designed to provide for a centrally located major shopping complex which will be serviced with conveniently located off-street parking compounds and safe pedestrian movement, but to exclude non-retail uses which generate a large volume of truck traffic.

12.02

PERMITTED PRINCIPAL USES:

(1) Any generally recognized retail business, service establishments or processing uses as follows:

(a) Those uses permitted in all residential districts.

(b) Apparel shops, including specialty shops of all sorts, shoe stores and similar uses.

(c) Shops selling automobile parts and accessories exclusively.

(d) Banks, loan offices, stock exchange office and other financial institutions.

(e) Commercial recreation facilities such as bowling alleys or movie theaters.

(f) Department Stores.

(g) Drug Stores.

(h) Eating and drinking-restaurants or other places serving food and/or beverages.

(i) Food stores including supermarkets and all types of specialty food stores such as bakeries, candy stores and similar uses.
(j) Furniture and appliances, including rugs, floor coverings, drapery, sewing machine shops used furniture, office equipment, supplies and similar uses.

(k) Gift shops, camera shops, record shops and similar uses.

(l) Hardware and related stores as paint, wallpaper and similar uses.

(m) Hotels and motels.

(n) Professional and other offices drawing a large number of clients and/or customers such as, but as not restricted to:

   (1) Chamber of Commerce, Automobile Clubs.

   (2) Doctors, dentists, lawyers, architects.

   (3) Insurance, realtors, unions.

   (4) Post office.

   (5) Utility Office.

(o) Publishing and printing.

(p) Repair shops such as shoe and watch repair.

(q) Service shops as barber, beauty, laundry, cleaner and similar uses.

(r) Travel agencies.

(s) Variety Stores.

(2) Public and semi-public buildings and privately-owned schools such as but not restricted to:

   (a) Churches.

   (b) Fraternal organizations.

   (c) Library.

   (d) Municipal Offices.
Article # 12, B-4, Central Business District

(e) Parking garages.

(f) Nursery school, provided that there is compliance with State requirements regarding space for play area per child either on-site or in a public play area no more than one (1) block from the facility.

(3) Other uses, which in the opinion of the Planning Board are similar to the above uses indicated as being permitted. The Planning Board shall receive a written recommendation from the Village Review Board when considering other or additional uses in the Old Village District. The following uses are expressly prohibited:

(a) Adult Entertainment Facilities, (See Article #18, Section 18.30);

(b) Auto service stations;

(c) Mechanized car wash facilities; and

(d) New or used auto sales lots or showrooms.

(4) Off-street parking facilities provided according to the provision of Section 18.16 excluding multi-story parking garages.

12.03

ACCESSORY USES:

Accessory structures and uses customarily incidental to the above permitted uses.

12.04

YARD REQUIREMENTS:

In a Central Business District Zone, the following yard areas shall be provided:

(1) Front Yards: No front yard shall be required except where the frontage on one (1) side of a block is divided between a Central Business District and a residential district, or across the street from a residential district, the front yard requirement of the residential zone shall apply to the area in the Central Business District.