AGENDA
Tuesday, September 15, 2020 | 7:00 pm
Virtual City Planning Commission Meeting (Online)

Join Zoom Meeting:

https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87167425730?pwd=T2locnZ6dnI3ZW56bj1qTWxzMjFpdz09

Meeting ID: 871 6742 5730
Passcode: FPPC

Meeting will also be broadcast LIVE on Spectrum Channel 17 and Fiopitics Channel 855

WORKSESSION

FPD 20-003  Special Exception – Adult Day Care – 1257 Kemper Meadow Dr.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

I. Call to Order

II. Roll Call

III. Minutes
   A. August 11, 2020

IV. Commissioner’s Reports

V. Director’s Report

VI. Communications from the Public
   If addressing the Commission, please wait for the chair to recognize you, state your name and address and please limit comments to 5 minutes. This meeting will be recorded for ease of transcription and will be broadcast by Waycross Community Media.

VII. New Business
   A. FPD 20-003  Special Exception – Adult Day Care – 1257 Kemper Meadow Dr.

VIII. Adjournment
The Forest Park Planning Commission Virtual Worksession was called to order at 7:02 p.m.

**FPD20-003: Special Exception: Adult Day Care – 1257 Kemper Meadow Dr.**

Mr. Anderson has no recommendation for this request. He needs additional information from the applicants such as state certification. He is requesting to postpone this item until further information is provided from the applicant.

Applicant Prakash Mishra said this has been delayed and they need to understand what is needed. Mr. Anderson said the back of the application had incomplete information.

Earl of RE Home Projects, said they can get information to Mr. Anderson in the next few days. Mr. Aaronson asked about the missing items. Mr. Anderson said a form and fee was received as well as a letter and their plan, but additional information was needed. Mr. Mishra asked how long it would be delayed. Mr. Aaronson said the worst case would be 4 weeks. Dilli Ram Adhikari purchased this property over a year ago. The whole process has been very long and they would appreciate it if Planning Commission would expedite the process.

**FPD 20-007 – Development Plan – Dollar General – 633 Northland Blvd.**

Mr. Anderson reviewed the redevelopment of this commercial site, formerly Chase Bank. The building has been vacant for 3 years. He reviewed the history of Northpoint Plaza redevelopment into Magna Machine and the outbuildings being built at various times. Dollar General has a contract to purchase. They would demolish the current building and build a 9100 sf building with parking would be in front of the building with loading/unloading in the rear of the building. There is mature landscaping and a 35’ buffer in front of and between the current building and McDonalds. Mr. Anderson reviewed the traffic plan and the eastbound access, the median blocks turning westbound onto Northland. This is a prototype store for Dollar General. From the previous submission, they have submitted an upgrade from the metal building.

Andrew Zofkie said the two main materials are EFIS and split cement block typical of the buildings in the area. They have a cornice over the awning. The sign would remain the same. Mr. Anderson recommends the same treatment in the back of the building. They have 27 spaces to park which is over the parking requirement. There is 34’ between parking where the delivery trucks will use the aisle area for maneuvering. He is requesting a monument sign. He is asking the plans reflect North being at the top. The islands are existing, but do not show the true edge. The service enclosure should be a walls of the same material of split face blocks with wall mounted lights. They will need a photometric projection. He is recommending with conditions.

Mr. Johnson asked what will remain as metal. Mr. Anderson stated 25% on one side. There is dark block with EIFS which is a stucco material. Mr. Johnson asked why there were no windows. Mr. Anderson stated he would defer to the applicant, but that this is normally because of shelves and fixtures. As examples, Target has no windows, and Walgreens windows are above the level of their displays. Mr. Johnson does not approve of the plans. They are incomplete and he does not like the look of the building. He does not think a Motion with 8 conditions is a complete plan.
Mr. Brown would like the applicant to do more work on the plans and landscaping.

Mr. Zofkie said the sidewalk landscaping, building materials in the rear matching 3 sides and changing the pylon sign to a monument sign should be able to be done. Mr. Anderson also mentioned the dumpster enclosure, and Mr. Zofkie said he understands it needs to be the same as the building.

Mr. Brown asked how soon they would start on the project. Mr. Zofkie said that once it is approved, it would be approximately 4-5 weeks to submit to the building permit. Mr. Brown asked how many employees they would have. Mr. Brown said he is not involved in the operation side, but he believes 6 employees.

Dr. Anuforo asked about the monument sign. Mr. Anderson explained it would be a lower sign shown above the driveway to Northland. She wanted clarification about the awning side and Mr. Anderson said it faced Northland.

Mr. Bradley asked about the store on Waycross. Mr. Anderson stated that was a Family Dollar which was converted from a Burger King 6-7 years ago and this submission is for Dollar General.

Mr. Aaronson agreed with the Mayor that the Motion with 8 conditions is more than there should be. The quality of the split face block and EIFS has a nice look. He cannot tell if the driveway to the rear is 10 or 20' to the property line. This is not a complete set of plans. Mr. Zofkie stated the distance is 20' and he will add to the plan.

Mr. Johnson stated his preference is for the plan to be as close to complete as possible, there are too many conditions and this was not what he expected for a resubmission. Mr. Anuforo stated she agrees and the details to the Planning Commission need to be complete so they know exactly what they are voting on. Mr. Bradley agrees with the Mayor and Ms. Anuforo. Mr. Aaronson said there needs to be more work on the rear side, plans showing the curbs and a separate roadway as well as landscaping. He believes this needs to be tabled again.

Mr. Zofkie stated he was not aware of the level of detail required for Planning Commission approval.

FPD 20-009 Sign Variance – Smart Local 24 - 1440 Kemper Meadow Drive
Mr. Anderson said the Smart Local previously applied for a Special Exception and were approved for their union offices and educational purposes. The building currently has two signs-one on Kemper Meadow and one on Kempersprings to the back of the building. Two signs are normal for corner lots. They are asking for one monument sign and one wall sign. Mr. Anderson does not believe the request meets all standards. He also mentioned the 160 s.f sign is larger than any monument sign. He is not recommending the wall sign as they currently have 2 monument signs which is more than most.

Mr. Johnson stated the signage they have now is very visible and he does not believe they need more signage. The 2 signs currently are huge. He suggested a small directional sign for the training location. This is not a drive-in business where customers would be looking for a sign.

Ms. Anuforo agrees with the Mayor saying the current sign is huge and since the woods have been pushed back, you can see from Winton Road. She said the words below SMART are too small and they need to have larger lettering. She believes what they have now is sufficient and shows up prominently.

Mr. Bradley agrees the monument signs are enough and they do not have foot traffic where an additional sign would attract customers.
Mr. Aaronson stated since there are standards for a variance which they don’t meet, it is hard to vote for. There is a reason for the regulations.

Mr. Hamant of Smart Local appreciated the Planning Commissioner’s meeting. He reviewed the Union’s history and said they currently have 2600 members. They do HVAC, architectural facades and metal work for signage. They offer a combination of skills technology. In January of 2019, they moved their union office to Forest Park and purchased and renovated the building and upgraded the landscaping.

Mr. Jeff Mueller said they would remove the ground sign not in use and replace with the wall sign for more visibility. They believe advertising is the key in successful business and would like to promote the industry. Dualite, a top 5 sign company, would make the sign which would be backlit. He had provided 4 other locations in the area that have a ground and wall sign. Mr. Aaronson asked if staff report had considered the removal of the second monument sign. Mr. Anderson said it was. They could use the second monument with a face change. Mr. Aaronson asked if the wall sign would be the same square feet as the monument sign. He did not mean to imply they would use all 3 signs. If granted, they would have to remove the ground sign to put up the wall sign.

Mr. Anderson will check files to see under what circumstances the other businesses were able to put up a ground and wall sign although this does not obligate Forest Park to approve.

FPD 20-010 – Development Plan Minor Revision – Ameritas Additional Parking
Mr. Anderson reviewed the background of the 70,000 sq. ft. one story office building constructed in 2014 and another 3 story office building at 1880 Waycross formerly housing Jacobs Engineering who moved to Sharonville. The 1880 building is currently being renovated and will be adding another company bringing 400 employees at this location. The current parking is not convenient and a new parking lot has been submitted for 134 parking spaces. All the City standards have been met and drainage calculations will be reviewed by the City Engineer. The proposed lot will extend the existing parking and be accessed by the same drive. Mr. Anderson said he recommends approval and appreciates the new unnamed business coming in so quickly after Jacobs Engineering moved.

Mr. Johnson appreciates the partnership the City has with Ameritas and the submitted plans being so complete. Mr. Aaronson agreed the plan is good and they are a first class company for the City.

Ms. Pugliese thanked the Planning Commission for their time and appreciates their strong working relationship with Forest Park. They believe this new tenant will bring great jobs to the City.

There were no other questions from Planning Commissioners.

Worksession closed as of 8:37 p.m.
Mr. Aaronson called the meeting of the Forest Park Planning Commission Meeting to order at 8:37 p.m.

All commissioners were in attendance.

The minutes of the July 21, 2020 meeting were accepted as presented.

Commissioner’s Report – None

Director’s Report – None

Communications from the Public – None

NEW BUSINESS

A. FPD 20-003 – Special Exception – Adult Day Care – 1257 Kemper Meadow Dr
   Mr. Johnson moved to table FPD 20-003 until a further time. Mr. Bradley seconded.

   Motion passed 7-0.

   Mr. Johnson moved to table FPD 20-007 until plans are finalized. Dr. Bunton seconded.

   Motion passed 7-0.

C. FPD 20-009 – Sign Variance – Smart Local 24 – 1440 Kemper Meadow
   Mr. Johnson moved to table FPD 20-009 until further research is completed. Dr. Bunton seconded.

   Motion passed 7-0.

   Discussion: Mr. Brown requested from Mr. Zofkie any research regarding capturing students with signage. Mr. Anderson will look at reasoning for other businesses.

D. FPD 20-010 – Development Plan Minor Revision – Ameritas Additional Parking
   Mr. Johnson moved to approve Development Plan Minor Revision 20-010 for a 134-space parking lot at Ameritas Life Insurance, 1876 Waycross Road, according to the plans dated 7-22-2020. Dr. Bunton seconded.

   Motion passed 7-0.

With no further discussion or comments, Mr. Aaronson closed the meeting at 8:45 pm.

_________________________________________            _________________________________________
CHAIRMAN – Dave Aaronson           SECRETARY – Dennis Smith
Memorandum

To: Planning Commission  
From: Chris Anderson, Community Development Director  
Subject: Director’s Report  
Date: September 14, 2020

Waycross Reserve
- All general site work is complete.
- All of the lots in the subdivision have been sold or are under contract.
- The City has received 8 permit applications for new home construction.
- The homebuilder has broken ground on the first home.

Rainstorm Car Wash
The developer has submitted the final building plans and the building permit is in process. Start of construction is this fall but no date set yet.

Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)
I submitted an application to Hamilton County for a grant to help purchase and install one of the new-style gateway signs on Northland Blvd near Route 4. The business welcome & advertising sign that was formerly owned by the Chamber of Commerce will be demolished and the new sign placed in the same location.

Single-Family Vacant Lots
The City owns 16 single-family vacant lots. The former houses on all of the lots were demolished by the City or the Hamilton County Land Bank as a result of property foreclosure and abandonment. The Planning Commission reviewed and approved most of these demolitions individually at public hearings in the period 2010-2019.

The strong housing market, which is beginning its third year, has led us to two conclusions: the number of houses that the City had obtained for $50,000 or less have dwindled to near-zero, and the time is a good one for the City to maximize its position as a seller. I am working on a Request for Proposals for developers to purchase the residential lots, with first opportunity to a developer who will provide a competitive bid for all 16, second opportunity for developers who want to buy groups (2-10) of the properties, and finally to developers or buyers who only want to purchase one lot. We are planning to require that the properties be developed in the next 12-24 months in order to deter speculators.

Sheetmetal Workers Union Signs, 1440 Kemper Meadow Drive
The applicant for this item, which was tabled at the August 11, 2020 meeting, has requested that it be held-over to the October meeting.
Planning Commission Staff Report

Special Exception 20-003: Adult Day Care

Hearing Date: September 15, 2018 7:00 PM

Applicant: Prakash Mishra for Americare Healthcare Services

Address: 1257 Kemper Meadow Drive (all suites)

Zoning District: SPA-1 Special Planning Area District 1

I. Executive Summary

The application is for an adult day care facility, which the applicants have indicated will service the senior population, age 65+. The facility could, however, also serve anyone of adult age, 21 or older. The clients are those for whom it is not advisable that they stay at home alone. Facilities of this type are already located in the Kemper Tech office park and the Kemper Meadow business center. Those facilities, along with child care centers, have changed the professional office environment to a mixed service-office environment. Special Exceptions are classified as such because it may be necessary to limit the location, concentration or total number of such uses in the City. In this area we have a concentration of related services, and additional facilities would add to that concentration. In addition, such facilities generate a demand for Emergency Medical Services far in excess of a comparable office use.

I recommend that the Planning Commission vote to deny the Special Exception application.

II. Request and Background

Request: Zoning Special Exception to permit an Adult Day Care facility at 1257 Kemper Meadow Drive in the Kemper Tech Center.

Background: Kemper Tech Center was developed in 1989 as the North x Northwest Office Park. It is located at the entrance to the Kemper Meadow Business Center and is zoned SPA-1, Special Planning Area District #1, Subdistrict “A”. The five buildings in the office park were converted to condominium ownership in 2018. The applicants purchased the 1257 building on December 26, 2019. The building is currently vacant.

The “A” subdistrict in the SPA-1 district includes all of the Kemper Tech Office Park. The principal permitted use for the zoning district is for administrative offices.

The adult day care is classified with social services, which include child day care, individual and family services, job training centers and residential care. All of the uses in this category, except for residential care, are classified as special exceptions in the SPA-1(A) district.
III. Special Exception Standards and Comments

The purpose of a special exception is to grant the Planning Commission the opportunity to permit only those specific uses (which are listed as special exceptions within a specific zoning district) which would not be appropriate generally or without restriction throughout the zoning
district but which may be permitted if the Planning Commission decides that the application satisfies the following standards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The public's health, safety, morals, welfare, and interest, including but not exclusively, such factors as safety and traffic conditions, surrounding housing or property values, and the socio-economic impact on people working or living in the area surrounding the proposed development</td>
<td>The proposed adult day care is unlikely to negatively affect the public’s health, safety, morals, welfare and interest. They are providing services that—for the individuals whom they serve—should have a positive effect on their own health, safety and welfare.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2  | Whether a nuisance caused by or increased by noise, litter, or lighting conditions will be created, and cannot be controlled; | The applicants have put great emphasis on this being a day care facility for senior (age 65+) adults. In the cover letter, however, the possible age range of clients includes 21-65, including those with developmental disabilities. We do not know the ratio of one group to another, or how much it would shift as clients are taken on or discharged.
Since this is a care facility, I don’t anticipate any issues with noise, litter or lighting conditions. That prediction would be even more certain with an exclusively older client population. |
| 3  | Whether the proposed development and attendant special exception would protect and preserve the character, attraction, and orderly development of the affected district; | The businesses and non-business tenants at a location have an effect on the character the area and this is true of the Kemper Tech office park, and to a lesser degree the Kemper Meadow Center as a whole, in which the overall number and size of non-profit organizations has increased in comparison to the for-profit businesses in the area.

Two examples that can be easily observed are the recent applications for fences in the Kemper Tech Center and the large multi-passenger vans and small buses that are located nearby at the Kemper Woods Center. Little Miracles Early Childhood School has a low decorative metal fence, and the Hopebridge Autism Therapy Center has a high solid fence. Although of different styles, both fences are used to enclose an area for outdoor recreation. The fences are noticeable because such enclosures are almost never found in an office environment. (Fences enclosing trash containers or mechanical equipment are more common).

At 1310 and 1330 Kemper Meadow Drive, the Creative Learning Workshop occupies two locations where they operate programs for adults with developmental disabilities. The vehicles are normally parked in the courtyard between the buildings. As the CLW has grown, so have the number of vehicles.

The above two examples are to point out that organizations providing a social service, particularly one involving care of individuals, will have an effect on the character of an area. It becomes visually less of an office environment and more of a services environment. |
That the proposal not be incompatible with the surrounding area and be an appropriate use as related thereto so as not to be economically, aesthetically, or environmentally detrimental or injurious to the surrounding area, or its workers or residents;

The applicants have not been specific about vehicles owned by Americare. They have said that all clients are dropped off at the location, similar to a child-care center.

The proposed Adult Day Care would probably not have much other visual impact on the area. In order to ensure that this remains so, if the Special Exception is approved, I recommend that a condition regarding signage be added to 1) Allow signs over the public entrance door and on the existing monument signs only, and 2) disallow any temporary signage such as banners or yard signs.

Whether adequate public facilities and services, including, but not exclusively, existing or proposed plans for water, storm sewer, and sanitary sewer, will be available or can be created to serve the anticipated needs of the development, and whether the provisions of such public facilities and services is economically feasible or reasonable to the city and its citizens;

The Creative Learning Workshops and GMR Exceptional Care (located on Reliance Drive at Hamilton Ave) account for the great majority of Emergency Medical Service Runs in their respective areas. If the clients of the proposed adult day care have a similar level of health or disability, then we could expect EMS runs to be elevated at this location as well. We can’t predict the future, but adding an agency that will add to calls for Emergency Service, above what an office tenant would add, simply isn’t prudent. If the effect is comparatively small, then it’s mainly a matter of additional supplies, and marginal wear on the vehicles. If the effect is greater, then it is possible that other residents or businesses would see a slower response time in an emergency. At the very high end, increased EMS runs can mean that the City will have to invest in additional vehicles, equipment and staff.

Other public facilities and services—including electricity, water, sanitary sewer, stormwater drainage, telephone and broadband—are available on site and I do not expect that this organization would put any strain on such services.

The effect of the proposal on vacant land or other proposed developments in the area so as not to render the use of such vacant land or the completion of such proposed developments unavailable or unlikely.

There are no other pending developments or vacant, developable land in the vicinity.

There are, however, vacancies, in the buildings in the Kemper Tech Center. I think it is likely that this agency will make it less likely that traditional office tenants will select this location.

In the past, the result has been higher vacancy. More recently, including this application, the vacancy is more likely to be filled with social services and non-profit agencies

### IV. Recommendation

In my opinion, the proposed Special Exception meets standards 1, 2 and 4 (with conditions), and does not meet standards 3 and 5, for the reasons outlined above. It technically meets standard 6, because that is concerned with land and development, not vacant floor space, but in my opinion the effect is the same whether it is for land, development, or building occupancy.

One reason for classifying a use as a Special Exception rather than as Permitted-By-Right is to control the number, location and concentration of such uses. In my opinion, it is not in the best interest of the City to allow an additional care facility of this type due to the number that we
already have. This conclusion stands whether one is examining the immediate environment (Kemper Tech Center), the vicinity (Kemper Meadow Business Center) or the City as a whole.

I recommend that the Planning Commission issue the following findings of fact and vote to reject the application.

V. Findings of Fact

1. Kemper Tech Center, despite its name, has had an increasing amount of its space used by non-profit, educational, and social service organizations, the presence of which has changed the environment from one of professional offices to a mixed office-service environment.

2. The proposed adult day care does not contribute to the maintenance of a professional office environment, and at its best it would not detract from the office environment.

3. Day care facilities (adult or child) and home health care agencies have used temporary promotional signage to advertise their service, but such signage is not appropriate for this location and should be restricted.

4. The aesthetic impact of the proposed adult day care would be minimal as presented, but it is unknown whether a change in the client profile or a shift in the type of care provided would result in a negative aesthetic impact, such as from vehicles or fencing.

5. The experience with other adult day care providers has shown that they generate a demand for Emergency Medical Services above a comparable office use, due to the health and disabilities of the clients.

6. The Special Exception classification is intended for uses that may need to be limited with regard their location, concentration and overall number in the City.

VI. Suggested Motion

Move to adopt the findings of fact as written in Section V of the staff report, and deny Special Exception FPD 20-003.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher A. Anderson, AICP
Director of Community Development
August 24, 2020

Christopher A. Anderson, aicp
Director of Community Development | City of Forest Park
Ohio Chapter President | American Planning Association

Re: Adult Daycare facility @ 1257 Kemper Meadow Drive. Forest Park, Ohio

Dear Mr. Anderson,

Concerning your letter issued on August 17, we offer the following answers. These answers represent the additional information requested.

1. The floor plan shows the two large rooms in the build with what looks like maximum occupancy number, is this also your client capacity or are those numbers different?
   Answer: The two large rooms are the activities area for adult day services, we shall have approximately 60 to 70 people at a given time which includes 40 clients and 30 employees.

2. The cover letter mentions “23.5 hour counseling and quality of life personal care services.” What does the 23.5 hour signify?? Does this mean that the facility will operate around one clock.
   Answer: The 23.5 hours signify the total number of per week. Each client will only be in the program 3 -4 hours a day.

3. How many parking spaces at maximum capacity – are needed?
   Answer: All clients will be picked up and dropped off by the agency’s vehicles at the given time.

4. Does the facility have its own vehicle? If yes, please list number and type of vehicle.
   Answer: 50 parking spaces are needed at the max capacity, the building has 70 plus parking spaces which will be used for the employees, guests, and agency’s vehicles parking, also there will be three vehicles owned by the facility.

5. The cover letter mentions applicable licenses and/or training certifications & separately mentions DODD or ODA – please provide copies of licenses, certifications or other documentation from these agencies.
   Answer: The only agency support that is partnering with this new program is the Department of the aging.

6. The client age range 21-65 seems to indicate that a high level of care is needed by clients. For example, a hypothetical client who is 30 years old – what conditions does that person have that they go to an adult daycare rather than stay at home, work at a job or be with family?
   Answer: The client range of 21-65 is given because we are the adult day service provider. The people with development disability, physical disability, senior adults who need assistance during the daytime, seniors who need companionship, etc.

7. The cover letter mentions indoor and outdoor activities. Assuming that all indoor activities are on-site, where would the outdoor activities take place?
   Answer: All indoor activities are held on-site. For outdoor activities, clients will be taken to the parks, museums, zoo, gardens, community events and temple/churches. Clients will be under the supervision of aides and the activity director at all time.

8. The Cover letter mentions an activity plan – please provide a written examples of an activity plan.
   Answer: The monthly activity plan is scheduled prior to the start of the month, all activities are performed as scheduled under the supervision of the on-site activity director. The activities that are done in the facility are as follow; Yoga, Art Craft, Playing card, Bingo, Movie session, Civic education, Safety lesson, Carrom board game, Reading/ writing English, Traffic rules lesson, socializing, Neglect/abuse reporting lesson, etc. See attached
9. You mentioned that you, are currently operating a similar facility in the Columbus area. Please provide the name and address of that facility.

Answer: We are currently operating a similar facility in Columbus area under the facility named Americare Healthcare Services, Inc. at 1279 E Dublin Granville Rd, Columbus, OH 43229.

Sincerely,

Dilli Adhikari
Owner
Planning Commission Staff Report – Revised for Third Meeting

FPD 20-007: Development Plan: Dollar General
Address: 633 Northland Blvd.
Zoning District: “PB” Planned Business District
Meeting Date: September 15, 2020 at 7:00 PM
Applicant: Andrew Zofkie, Cross Development

I. Background

NOTE: This report has been revised and references to the plan are for the site plan and building elevations dated 8/25/20. Sections of this report that are new are highlighted.

Cross Development, a developer for Dollar General, has contracted to purchase the former Chase Bank branch at 633 Northland Blvd. They plan to demolish the bank building and construct a new store on the site, while retaining some of the current site, including the north-south driveway, the planting strip along Northland Blvd., and most of the landscaped area next to McDonald’s.

This site was originally developed along with the Central Park Plaza located behind it. That site was redeveloped in 2019 by Magna Machine for their roller-coaster business.

Dollar General is a “small-box” discount chain that focuses on everyday necessities. The company pioneered the “dollar store” model, originally (in 1955) pricing all merchandise at $1 or less. Dollar General does not currently have any locations in Forest Park, although the company was formerly a tenant at the old K-Mart Plaza (now demolished) at Hamilton & Waycross Roads and at the Forest Park Plaza shopping center just to the east of this location.

II. Development Plan

The development plan calls for the current building to be demolished and new 9,100 square foot store to be constructed approximately 50 feet farther back from the road than the current building. The parking is located in front of the building and is planned for 27 spaces. The Zoning Code requires 23 parking spaces for a retail building of less than 10,000 square feet.

The site has a two-way drive that connects to Northland on the north, and a shared-access drive on the south. The Northland entrance is right-in/right-out, for traffic moving eastbound on Northland. Traffic to and from all other directions uses the shared-access drive, which is owned by Magna Machine. The shared-access drive serves all of the properties along the south side of Northland Blvd. and provides access to Waycross Road and Southland Road as well. This drive will be repaved, and it appears from the plan that the median strip in the northern part of the drive will be removed.

The plan shows the landscaped areas on the north and east sides of the property as retained, although the placement of the building and sidewalk on the southeast side of the property will be
within 3 feet of the property line. It is very unlikely that the existing trees can be protected from the excavation required from construction and if this development is approved, we should not count on the trees surviving construction. If they did survive, they would be located within 7-8 feet of the building, which is very close and not normally recommended for good of the building or of the tree.

**Signs**
The sign shown on the plan is for a Dollar General monument sign. The Sign Code allows a monument sign to be up to 9 feet in height in the PB District. This area of Northland contains a mix of monument and pylon signs. A monument sign is more appropriate at this location. It would match the size and height of the signs for all of the out-lot businesses in the vicinity except for McDonalds. We are expecting, however, that McDonald’s will be applying for a full rebuild of their store and I anticipate that they will change to a monument sign at that time. We are also working with Magna Machine to replace the old Northpoint sign with a monument sign at that location. I recommend that the Planning Commission require that any ground sign on this site must be a monument sign, with a maximum height of 6 feet and a maximum area of 72 square feet.

The building plans show a second sign over the entrance of the building. This is scaled to fit over the entrance of the building and is my preferred location for a sign at this site. The Sign Code allows all single-use business locations to have one sign as of right. A business can apply for a master signage plan to allow more than one sign, and the Planning Commission has the discretion to approve such a plan. For this location, however, I recommend that only one sign should be permitted, with the applicant choosing whether to have a ground sign or wall sign, but not both.

**Lighting**
The bank used pole mounted lights with angled fixtures to provide site lighting. This type of fixture is now considered obsolete (due to excessive light spillover) and is rarely used in new construction. These fixtures will need to be removed in any case for the redevelopment of the site. The development plan does not show any new freestanding light fixture locations. The building plans have wall-mounted lighting fixtures to illuminate the areas close to the building. The property to the west and south (the old shopping center) was retrofitted with LED fixtures in 2017. I recommend that a photometric projection of the site lighting levels be provided and shown on a revised development plan. The revised building elevations show the lights as “downward directed, dark sky compliant LED lights.” In an email, the applicant stated the following:

“This item is typically handled during project design, and will be provided during our building permit submittal. The intent is always to minimize foot-candles at the property lines. We anticipate one new, 2-head pole light at the north parking lot boundary.”

In summary, the new 2-pole light is not shown on the plan, and a photometric projection has not been submitted.

**Building Exterior**
Dollar General makes extensive use of pre-engineered metal structures, and one of their prototype designs was originally proposed here. In response to my comments and those from the Planning Commission, the applicant has revised the building a second time, as shown on the attached plans. The four sections on the front with shutters are representative of windows, although the building
will not have actual windows. That is not unusual for a modern retail building, although some retail designs (Walgreens is an example) incorporate clerestory windows to bring in natural light and still allow store fixtures along the outside walls.

The exterior materials are EIFS and split-face CMU block in the standard earth tones found on other Dollar General stores. EIFS is the main surface material, with painted split-face CMU used on columns and the area framing the entrance doors on the front of the building.

Over the Labor Day weekend, I happened to see a newer Dollar General store in the City of Euclid at 20215 Euclid Avenue. The picture provides an idea of what this store might look like, although it appears to have additional features that have not been proposed here.

20215 Euclid Ave, Euclid, Ohio

This building appears to be similar in size, or smaller, than the proposed store. It has an all-masonry exterior on the visible sides, with brick instead of EIFS as the main material. It also has a different treatment for the faux windows with a lighter color and awnings above. The faux windows extend to the (visible) side of the building.

Another parallel is that the store in the picture is located directly in front of a manufacturing business and the general vicinity has a mix of retail, industrial and residential uses. The area is no more upscale than Northland Blvd, nor is the City of Euclid, which is a charter member of the First Suburbs Consortium.

The applicant is a developer and is working within a budget provided by Dollar General. Nonetheless, the building exterior treatment submitted is quite evidently not the best that Dollar General could propose.
Parking and Loading
Included in the plan is a truck-turning study to show how a truck would enter the site, park, unload and depart the site. The need to turn the truck in the customer parking area results in a drive aisle that is 34 feet wide. This is 10 feet wider than the Zoning Code requires and adds about 9% to the paved area in front of the store. The store does not have a loading dock, only a loading door on at the rear right side of the building. Two dumpsters are planned to be located next to the loading area. The plan has been revised to note that the dumpsters are to be screened with a solid wall matching the CMU block on the building.

Landscaping
The plan shows that the existing landscaping in front, including the 35-foot landscape buffer, be preserved on the site and not disturbed. It also shows the same for the landscaped area on the east side of the site, shared with McDonalds, although it also shows the eastern edge of the new parking and the sidewalk around the building as encroaching on that landscaped area. This landscape strip has mature trees on it which are very unlikely to survive if there is earthwork and paving occurring that close to the trees. McDonald’s is gearing up to demolish the current building next door and build a new store at the same location. It is unknown if they will be modifying their parking at that time. I recommend that the Planning Commission include a condition that any dead trees in this planting strip be removed and replaced with an equivalent tree, in coordination with the future McDonald’s redevelopment. (For example, both property owners could present an alternate landscape revision or tree replacement at a future date).

There is no new landscaping shown on this plan. Many Dollar General stores have no landscaping or very minimal landscaping. At the building, the concrete paving goes right to the wall without any planting beds in between. The unbroken expanses of paving transitioning into the concrete block walls gives the site a harsh appearance and does nothing to fit in or contribute to the streetscape on Northland Blvd. At the August meeting I recommended that the applicant develop a landscape plan that at a minimum adds planting beds where the building and pavement meet. The revised plan shows planting beds between the sidewalk and the building. No detail is shown for what might be planted in the beds.

Forest Park Redevelopment Plan
The City’s Redevelopment Plan does not have any recommendations for this specific property, but has discussion and recommendations for the Northland Business District. The recommendations in the plan that have been implemented include:

- Property acquisitions and demolitions at 640, 660, 680 and 702 Northland Blvd.
- The Northland Streetscape Improvements
- Construction of a city parking lot at 680 Northland
- Property acquisition for a City Green to be developed between the two shopping centers.

In addition, the City worked with and incentivized Magna Machine to purchase the former Northpoint Center in order to consolidate and expand their operations. That project is approximately 75% complete, with the Magna office construction still pending. In short, the City has invested a substantial sum of money and other resources in the Northland area.
The Redevelopment Plan also discusses how various redevelopment scenarios (specifically for two gateway properties) can either contribute to the redevelopment of the overall area or not contribute to it. Encouraging contributing developments and discouraging non-contributing developments is essential to this strategy, because even with the large amount of public investment, the private sector investment will almost certainly be greater, and will ultimately determine whether the City succeeds or fails in the redevelopment of Northland Blvd.

### III. Recommendation

The Dollar General store is a permitted use (“General Merchandise Stores”) in the Planned Business District, and the Planning Commission’s review is for the building and site without providing an opinion on whether another small-box discount store is necessary to serve the area.

There are no “hidden” parts of the site due to the surrounding development and the east-west private drive that serves this and the other properties in the area.

In response to our comments, the applicant has revised the building exterior with an EIFS surface and split-face CMU columns and extended this treatment to all four sides. This is an improvement over the prototype store, but clearly it is not the best that Dollar General could offer.

The site plan has been revised to show the curb edge on the south side of the property and has been reoriented to show North at the top of the page.

Between the changes in the banking industry and the conditions we are living in now, I have no realistic expectation that another bank would buy the site, and if that were likely it would have almost certainly have happened by now. I don’t believe that Forest Park can “hold out” for this site to return to productivity as a bank.

Redevelopment of this property is the most likely outcome with any end-user. This redevelopment has been difficult mainly due to the company’s development standards, which in their prototype format would not fit on this section of Northland Blvd. I recommend that the Planning Commission approve the development plan with all of the listed conditions, and that the applicant provide revised plans reflecting those conditions.

The applicant has largely been responsive to comments from me and from the Planning Commission, but I continue to have significant reservations about this application and plan, for the following reasons:

- **Additional Retail.** The City of Forest Park currently has more retail land and square footage than can be absorbed by the market for the foreseeable future. This development, by changing the land use at 633 Northland from banking to retail, adds space that the City does not need.

- **Site Arrangement.** The position of the building, with all of the parking in the front and the building approximately 50 feet behind the current bank building is a departure from the site arrangement found on the properties along the south side of Northland between Waycross and Southland. The existing buildings are located a similar distance from the road, and have all or some of their parking along the side of the building.
• **Small-Box Retail in the Area.** The Northland area already has another small-box retailer at Forest Park Plaza. The City’s other two business districts each have a small-box retailer. Access to Dollar General is already available to Forest Park residents at their locations on Hamilton Avenue in Pleasant Run and on Winton Road in Greenhills, as well as Route 4 Fairfield, or Route 747 in West Chester.

• **Minimal Site Enhancements.** As noted, the applicant has been responsive to our comments, but the development plan does not include a photometric projection, the landscape beds near the building have no information on what will be planted in them, and other than planning to retain existing site landscaping, the investment in landscaping by the company is very minimal.

• **Building Enhancements are Less Than Found Elsewhere.** As noted, I took a picture of a new Dollar General store in the Cleveland area over the holiday weekend. The areas share some similar characteristics, but there may be differences that matter to Dollar General. Given the City’s own investment in the area, as well investment by long-time area businesses such as Magna Machine, we should not accept “second-best” for this area, and it is long past time for developers to stop “designing down” to whatever minimums they may find in our code, and instead give us their best effort to start, especially when that is taking place elsewhere.

For these reasons, my conclusion is that the proposed Dollar General is the wrong development for this location, and I recommend that the Planning Commission vote “NO” on the suggested motion that follows.

**IV. Suggested Motion**

Move to approve Development Plan Minor Revision 20-007 for Dollar General at 633 Northland Blvd according to the plans dated. 8/25/20, with the following conditions:

1. The monument sign may only be a maximum of 6 feet in height and 72 square feet in area, and the wall sign must be deleted from the plan.

2. The applicant must submit a planting plan for the landscape areas next to the building.

3. A photometric projection must be submitted.

4. Any trees currently on the site that are damaged or otherwise die must be replaced with an equivalent species of sufficient size, in accordance with Chapter 98 of the Code of Ordinances (tree replacement).

Respectfully Submitted,

Christopher A. Anderson, AICP
Director of Community Development
August 17, 2020

Andrew Zofkie
CD DG Forest Park, LLC
9461 Kenwood Rd
Cincinnati, OH 45242

Re: Development Plan FPD 20-007 - Dollar General - 633 Northland Boulevard

Dear Mr. Zofkie:

The Forest Park Planning Commission met on Tuesday, August 11, 2020 and postponed the decision on a Dollar General planned at 633 Northland Boulevard until further plans are submitted, specifically:

1. The exterior building materials must be the same on all four sides and the rear wall revised to reflect that requirement.
2. The pylon sign shown on the development plan must be deleted. If a ground sign is substituted, it must be a monument sign with a maximum height of 6 feet and a maximum area of 72 square feet, OR the applicant may elect to use the wall sign and delete the ground sign entirely.
3. Additional landscape beds are to be provided adjacent to the building, sufficient to break up the continuous paved edge.
4. The dumpster and loading area must be enclosed on three sides with walls of the same split-face CMU block as the building and the enclosure must meet all of the dimensional requirements of the Zoning Code.
5. A photometric projection must be included with a revised plan.
6. Any trees currently on the site that are damaged or otherwise die must be replaced with an equivalent species of sufficient size, in accordance with Chapter 98 of the Code of Ordinances (tree replacement). Changes to the east landscaped strip can be coordinated with McDonalds at the applicant’s option.
7. The development plan must be revised to show what material will form the southern boundary of the property.
8. Revised plans shall be oriented so that North is at the top of the page.

Please submit revised plan for Planning Commission review.

Sincerely,

Christopher A. Anderson, AICP
Community Development Director
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NOTES:

1. SITE PLAN PREPARED WITHOUT BENEFIT OF TITLE OPINION, DEED RESTRICTION, OR SURVEY

2. SITE SUBJECT TO CHANGE PENDING ALL STATE AND CITY ORDINANCES OR DEED RESTRICTIONS

3. BUILDING AND SITE SIGN LOCATION, SQUARE FOOTAGE, AND TYPE SUBJECT TO CHANGE PENDING ALL STATE AND CITY ORDINANCES OR DEED RESTRICTIONS

SITE PLAN

SCALE: 1" = 60'
These drawings are intended to illustrate the basic design concept of the proposed exterior design. Additional building design development may occur pending further review by the owner, tenant, jurisdiction(s), and architect. Final construction documents shall govern over preliminary design concept submittals.