

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF December 13, 2017

6:00 P.M. Council Chambers

745 Center Street, Milford, OH 45150

The Planning Commission of the City of Milford met in regular session on the evening of Wednesday, December 13, 2017, at Council Chambers, 745 Center Street, Milford, OH 45150.

Roll Call:

Vice Chair, Mike Huseman called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 6:05 p.m. Other members present at tonight's meeting are Dino Pelle, Oliver Roe, and Laurie Howland.

Staff: Pam Holbrook, Asst. City Manager

Visitors: Eric Boyd, CESO; Steve Gagliardi, CESO; Aric Platt, DDC; Rev. Richard Bollman, Xavier University; Jon Lenihan, 5364 S. Milford Rd.; Chris Komnick, 59 Mound Ave.; Mary Ellen Fellingner, 5879 SR 132; Ed Geiser, 5361 S. Milford Rd.; T.R. Knopf, 149 Laurel Ave.; Tom Wagner, 5392 S. Milford Rd.; Carl Samson, 233 Laurel Ave.; Bob & Gail Laudeman, 5388 S. Milford Rd.; Elham Emmons, 5371 S. Milford Rd.; Marion Tenhend(?), 203 Mound Ave.; Father Paul Macke, 5361 S. Milford Rd.; Rich Godfrey, 434 Mill St.; Carol Cyran and Maddie & Hayley Samson, 233 Laurel Ave.; Keven McSweeney, 1304 Duncan Ave, MSC; Patricia Messner, 15 White Water Way; Sister Therese Gilman, 5361 S. Milford Rd.; Andrea Col(?), 5361 S. Milford Rd.; Pat Chandler, 43 Mound Ave.; Mary Donahue, 125 Cleveland Ave.; Brad Price, 32 Main; Erin & Peggy Head, 128 Laurel; Susie & Henry Heinz, 300 Garfield; Jeff Labanz, 54 Mound Ave.; Jennifer Liles, 375 Hickory St.; Bruce Shaffer, 5338 S. Milford Rd.; Douglas Smith, 115 Laurel Ave.; Michael Hefferan, Jr., 15 Cleveland; David Emmons, 5371 S. Milford; Ken Waeber, 431 Garfield Ave.; Tim Oliver, 209 Laurel Ave.; Eric Nichols, 5361 S. Milford; Joe Neidhard, 5361 S. Milford; Megan Brooks, 5361 S. Milford; Shannon Grosheim, 5361 S. Milford; Jose V. Paris II, 5361 S. Milford; Victoria Phillips 154 Mound; Chelsea & Dawn Hillman, 32 Cleveland; Sandy Russell, 55 Laurel; Brian McNair, Wyler Fast Lane, LLC; Len Harding, 222 Cleveland; Sean Reynolds, 102 Cleveland; Becky Linser, 134 Cleveland; Deborah Floyd, 39 Cleveland

Mr. Roe made a motion to excuse Ms. McKnight; seconded by Ms. Howland. The ayes carried.

Ms. Holbrook read the Staff Report for case SITE 17-11 into the record:

Project:	SEM Terrace Independent Living Units
Location:	5371 South Milford Road
Property Owner:	SEM Villa II Inc 5371 South Milford Road Milford, OH 45150
Applicant:	Same
Acreage:	13.01 Acres
Tax Parcel Id:	210733.016
Zoning:	I, Institutional District
Use:	Continuing Care Retirement Facility

ADJACENT LAND USE AND ZONING

Surrounding property:

North: I, Institutional District, SEM Campus;

South and West: I, Institutional District, Jesuit Center;

East: R-1, Large Lot Residential District, Single Family Homes.

PROPOSAL

SEM Villa Retirement Communities is requesting approval from Planning Commission to construct five (5) duplexes and ten (10) triplex, single-story, independent living units on the property located at 5371 South Milford Road. Building 'G' on the site plan will be a maintenance shed. The parcel id is 210733.016. The property is 13.01 acres in size and zoned I, Institutional District.

NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING

Property owners within 800 feet were notified of the proposed development, and invited to attend a Neighborhood meeting on November 2nd at City Hall. 21 letters were mailed to property owners; sixteen neighbors and five SEM representatives attended the meeting. The purpose of the meeting was to allow the neighbors to hear the developer's proposal, ask questions, and express concerns. See attached minutes.

ANALYSIS

Zoning

The subject site is zoned 'I', Institutional District and consists of 110 existing independent living units. The use is classified as Continuing Care Retirement Facilities which is defined as "a housing development that is planned, designed, and operated to provide a full range of accommodations and service for older adults, including independent living, congregate housing (self-contained apartments) and medical care." Continuing Care Retirement Facilities is a permitted use in the Institutional District.

Setbacks and Lot Area

Setback requirements may vary when property is adjacent to residential districts or uses. In this case, the required front setback for buildings along South Milford Road is no less than 50 feet from any residential district or use. Adjacent property to the north and west is an Institutional district and use; the minimum side yard setback is to be no less than 10 feet from each side lot line. The rear setback requirement is 20 feet from the rear lot line. The applicant appears to meet all setback requirements.

There are no minimum lot area requirements in the Institutional district.

Driveways, Parking, and Lighting

The site will utilize an existing driveway for access to 19 of the units, the Fire Department was concerned about ingress and egress in the area of Building D and E. The applicant provided a Fire Truck movement plan to the Fire Department; this plan has been reviewed and the Fire Department does not believe there will be any issues accessing this site.

The applicant proposes to install a new driveway allowing access to the other 21 units. Staff recommends that both driveways conform to city specifications.

The applicant proposes to add 82 parking spaces to the existing 26 spaces providing a total of 108 parking spaces for all units. The Zoning Ordinance does not specify a minimum number of required parking spaces; the applicant only needs to provide an adequate number of spaces for the proposed use or expansion. The applicant has indicated that not all senior residents will have a car and therefore, believes that the shared parking provided will be adequate. Staff is concerned that parking spaces have not been provided for Building units F, J, K, and P and would ask that the applicant address this during the Planning Commission meeting.

The applicant has provided a lighting plan. Section 1187.10 specifies that the maximum pole height for non-cutoff lights is 10 feet and 24 feet for cutoff lights. The applicant indicates they will be using a 19 foot pole. Footcandle at the property line is not to exceed 0.5. It appears that footcandles at the property line exceeds 0.5 on page 4 of the lighting plan; staff would like to see page 2 resubmitted showing the footcandles at the property line for the area in question.

Landscaping and Bufferyard

The applicant proposes to use a 3 foot high mound along South Milford Road with a variety of plantings to screen the development from the residential use across the street. They have also added a variety of evergreens along the perimeter of the property that is adjacent to the Jesuit Center. The landscaping appears to exceed the minimum landscaping and bufferyard requirements. Staff recommends that plantings within the sight triangle be removed to allow for safe egress from the site.

Elevations

The applicant proposes to use a combination of brick and Hardie plank siding for their elevations. The Zoning Ordinance does not specify that particular materials are required.

Utilities

The Water Department, Wastewater Department, and City Engineer have reviewed the plans and feel that all City services can be provided.

Safety Services

The Fire Department provided the following data regarding their fire and ems run numbers to the SEM complex:

Fire and EMS Runs to the SEMs (2017 numbers are thru November 2, 2017)

	<i>201 Mound Ave</i>	<i>203 Mound Ave</i>	<i>225 Cleveland</i>	<i>5371 South Milford</i>
2012-2016 Fire	93	20	24	58
2012-2016 EMS	754	328	96	710
2017 Fire	30	7	10	11
2017 EMS	204	64	32	130

Chief Baird stated that the addition of 40 units to SEM Terrace will increase their runs by approximately 40 per year (His rule of thumb is one detail per apartment per year-the older the population the better the accuracy). He felt that the Fire Department would be able to support the 40 unit increase.

Accident data obtained from the Police Department shows that there were 2 accidents reported on South Milford Road in 2016 and 2017. One accident involved a deer and the other involved a person backing out of their driveway.

The applicant has provided a Traffic Impact Study which concludes that the development will generate 106 trips per day on a typical weekday, of which 6 trips will be generated during the Weekday AM Peak Hour and 9 trips will be generated during the Weekday School Peak Hour. The report also states the SEM Terrace Drive/South Milford intersection currently is performing at a level of service 'A'. Under the 2018 Build traffic scenario (with the 2nd driveway), both intersections are performing at an overall level of service 'B' or higher.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

While the use as a Continuing Care Retirement Center is permitted by right the question came up during the neighborhood meeting that there was an agreement between the Jesuit Center and SEM administration regarding the use of the property as agreed to between the Jesuit Center and SEM. To date I have not

received additional information on this topic. This should be addressed at the Planning Commission meeting.

If this condition is not addressed at the Planning Commission meeting this evening to the satisfaction of the Commission then Staff recommends deferring the project until the January meeting so that the documentation in question may be sufficiently addressed. The following are a list of conditions of approval:

1. City approval is contingent on review and approval by any other applicable local, state, and federal agencies.
2. All recommendations included in the Milford Community Fire Department letter dated September 12, 2017 and addressed to David Oaks.
3. Both driveway entrances to meet City specifications.
4. Address lack of parking spaces for Buildings F, J, K, and P.
5. Resubmit lighting plan showing footcandles at the property line, equal or less than 0.5 footcandles. Indicate that lights are to be full cutoff.
6. Remove plantings within the sight triangle at both driveway entrances.

Mr. Pelle asked what percentage of fire/ems goes to that area versus the entire city. Ms. Holbrook stated she did not know but could find out from the Fire Department. Ms. Howland stated that we have just had the big fire/ems levy this year, and during those discussions it was noted that their runs were up this year which means they have to hire more EMT's. The strain on the fire/ems system is to the point that they have asked for an increase in the tax levy this past year and council said 'no' to this request, but if we continue to increase the runs down to SEM the Fire Department will need to ask for a levy increase when they come back in two years. As runs increase, the need to hire additional EMT's will increase as well as the purchase of additional ambulances. Mr. Pelle asked whether the additional resources that are required to go to one area may impact or delay resources to another area. Ms. Howland stated that it means the City becomes more reliant on Miami Township for their services. Ms. Holbrook stated the surrounding communities have signed a mutual aid agreement which means each community supports the other as needed. Ms. Howland stated they are adequately staffed now, but as more runs are added they will need to add more personnel. Any increase in the levy is added to the property owners taxes.

Mr. Huseman asked about the economic impact of this project. Since they are a non-profit, do they pay property tax; how are city services paid for besides water and sewer tap fees? Ms. Holbrook stated that the City would collect on any earnings tax through employees and residents.

Mr. Emmons stated that SEM Terrace pays approximately \$85,000 a year in property taxes even though they are a nonprofit. We are looking at approximately a \$5 1/2 million dollar project so that would be an added increase in property value. Ms. Howland stated a majority of that property tax goes to the County, and only a small portion comes to the City.

Mr. Emmons stated that SEM Terrace is a 110 unit facility that has been in Milford since 1976. SEM consists of multiple separate entities and we are the independent living units. We provide no medical services and are nonsubsidized; are tenants do not receive any assistance from the county or other places. SEM's goal is to provide affordable housing for seniors; strive to preserve human dignity and individual freedoms in a relaxed and caring environment. We are an aging in place concept. We started looking at how to improve SEM approximately 3 years ago; our research showed that the senior population was growing at a 15-20% rate in the next 20 years. Milford has about 6,000 residents which would mean about an additional 1,500 seniors age 65 and over in the next 20 years in Milford alone. Mr. Emmons stated the Board directed him to look into options to expand the facility, after reviewing financing; we teamed up with CESO to look at concepts that would work on the site. We did not want to bring in an institutional type of building, but rather a more home oriented living style. Each of the 40 units has an entrance at the

front of the building with easy access. I've asked for 48 inch doorways and the entry is zero step. We are trying to fill a need, because many Milford residents would like to stay in the community. Each unit is about 1,100 square feet each, one bedroom and two full baths because a lot of the residents would be couples, a small kitchen and a den.

In the SEM communities we are the first step in the process of aging and we are trying to enhance what we have been offering for the last 40 years by offering something that is a little larger and more comfortable. Our residents only pay for telephone, tv, etc. Utilities are included and food is provided at a reasonable price, the existing units rent for approximately \$1,077. The new units would rent for \$1,400-1,600 per month; we were hoping to appeal to the 65-70 age group. Our goal is to make sure no one goes dark, and always has electricity. There are many places in Milford that exceed \$3,000 per month, the average person is probably paying between \$2,000-5,000 per month; that is very difficult and not affordable living. This is one of the goals SEM has had at their inception.

Eric Boyd, Lead Engineer, stated that they tried to keep a balance of open space and additional homes for senior citizens with this layout. There was an issue with the Fire Truck access when the trucks go around that corner, the truck goes over the sidewalk. We have widened out the pavement in that area and have run software to determine that the fire truck can make it around that area. Mr. Boyd showed several views from South Milford Road and the Jesuit Center as it may appear in 5 years. Our goal is to maintain that level of serenity because the residents that will be living there want that view as much as anyone. The 3 foot berm runs along South Milford Road and transitions out to the property line. Mr. Boyd clarified that they will have to remove some landscaping at the entrance/exit to make sure sight lines are open, but the berms will not interfere with the sight line.

Mr. Boyd stated the Traffic Impact Study indicated if they put stop signs at both driveways the Level of Service for both drives would be maintained at a Level 'A' for South Milford Road. Our traffic impact is nonexistent. Ms. Howland stated that you show 106 trips a day on a very narrow road with a blind turn, traffic is a concern of mine; 106 trips a day on that street is quite a lot. 106 cars would be a big change for those that live on South Milford Road; Cleveland is already too busy as it is. Ms. Howland stated that she found it odd that out of 106 trips only 6 cars would be leaving at the peak hours in the morning. Mr. Boyd stated that these people are not coming and going at peak hour times; senior citizens tend to travel at non peak hours. Mr. Boyd stated if you had a 40 unit apartment complex, you would not have a staff of 6 people.

Mr. Roe asked what the traffic count is today. Mr. Boyd stated the overall traffic count in peak hours was over 500 cars; this development would be a 1% increase in peak hours. The 106 trips is in a 12 hour day, if we had 10 cars per hour that would be 120 cars and this is based on a snapshot of 1 day. Mr. Boyd stated that they typically perform traffic impact studies on days that are recommended by the standards; it is a Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday not during a holiday time. People are going to school and work. Mr. Pelle asked if the 1% included visitors to the complex. Mr. Boyd stated that it does include visitors, staff, nurses and emergency services. Ms. Howland asked if that meant only six people would be coming during that time frame and Mr. Boyd stated yes that is what the study suggests. Mr. Pelle stated he found that hard to believe since he lives on that street.

Mr. Emmons stated that a lot of the traffic that you see is for all the SEM communities, as many people use this as a cut through, we get through street traffic on the private drive. We would be expecting two additional employees; a maintenance worker and an office worker. He noted that only 12 out of 85 existing residents now drive. Ms. Emmons stated that the entrance off of Mound is being used by the nurses and aids; they can access all of the SEM facilities through that access.

Steve Gagliardi, Architect, we are looking at triplex and duplex units, and each unit is about 1,100 square feet. We are trying to complement the existing building and the roof lines. We have designed a primary

ridge line system that matches the dimensional shingle system and then bisected by each porch at the entry. Each building will provide a different material; the residents could choose what they would like; there is a mixture of siding and brick, with a dormer for natural light, and fenestration on all facades. Mr. Pelle asked if these options have been finalized. Mr. Gagliardi stated these are all possible design elements and we would take these if approved and finalize it. He stated that residents could then choose package A, B, or C. We are looking at earth tones consisting of tans, yellow, and gray that would tie in with the existing building with a 40 year dimensional shingle. The idea was to create this residential feel in a single story unit. This unit is a little larger footprint than what you would typically see in senior housing. Mr. Huseman asked about the relationship of the peak height of the roof to the existing building. Mr. Gagliardi stated that this roof is a little higher but still under 19 feet. We went with a steeper slope, the existing is 6:12 and we are at 7:12 at the main ridge; we did that to open up the inside a little bit more. The purpose of the dormers is to provide sunlight to the living space. They are modest, this is not high style architecture, but it is an upgrade from what they are living in now.

Mr. Emmons stated that the current units are 288 square feet, a bedroom, a closet and a bathroom. We don't have specific counts but daily we receive 3-4 calls, we refer them on to other facilities. All the SEM communities utilize the drives so that part remains the same. The line of sight on the existing drive is a 300-400 foot minimum. We are adding walking paths and everything is interconnected. Ms. Holbrook asked whether the development is 100% occupied; Mr. Emmons stated yes, we have been for 3-4 months. There are 11 people on our waiting list at our existing facility.

Ms. Howland questioned whether this would work on lesser density. Mr. Emmons stated that they could. Ms. Howland thanked all the residents who attended; she stated that at the end of the day when the architects and builders leave, this is your home. I believe the integrity of your neighborhood is at stake here, and that is why you care so much. Ms. Howland stated that in this city people feel passionate about heart, character, and integrity of the city and that is why they move here. It is easy to see that if it checks a bunch of boxes then you can go ahead and build it, but this is not how this city works. We just had a steering committee that has met over the past 6 months to deal with exactly this issue: How do we envision the city, how do we keep the character and integrity intact, and does this project fit into the vision. Ms. Howland stated that she felt the density is too high for that area; I have an issue with the increase on ems. Our former fire chief was adamantly opposed to the Milford Main senior living project because of the pressure on the ems. I fear the tax levy increase because when the architect and builder leave, all these people here will have to face a property tax increase. I feel the density is too high, too close to the road; I am not in favor of a second driveway because it puts too much pressure on that street especially with the school. I don't think a one day traffic study is sufficient because it doesn't give me the picture of what I need to see. I drive that road on a daily basis. Can you make this work on a lesser density? At the end of the day, these people have a right to protect the integrity of their neighborhood. Over development is death to a community, high density is death to a community; all these people are trying to protect their investment and the integrity of their community. Can you bring it back to the Commission with less density, push it back farther from the road, and do not add a second driveway?

Mr. Emmons stated that he thought the Commission was to give them guidance. We went for the smaller density. If the Commission says no we can't, what can we build, then I would have to go back and see what infrastructure offsets our cost. I can't say that we can build 20-25 units, and removing one driveway puts everything on one side of SEM. We would have to take it to the Board to see what their thoughts were. Ms. Howland asked whether there is anyway to connect the existing driveway to the units on the other side so there is not another curb cut on the street, and remove the two units closest to the street. Mr. Emmons stated these are items we would have to look at. Ms. Howland stated that people do not like to have buildings pressed up to the street. Mr. Boyd stated that the buildings are a minimum of 50 feet from the right of way, and the crowding feel is coming from all the trees we have added. Mr. Emmons asked what would be an appropriate density. We have removed one building near the circle drive, but it is an extreme expense to continually redesign. Mr. Pelle stated that his concern was density, but had the

neighbors been participating with you much sooner in the process this wouldn't have come to us. I have a concern that you waited far too long to involve the spirit of the community in that kind of negotiation. Mr. Emmons stated this is where we started officially, this is a concept. If we put more units in a larger building but pushed the buildings back, would that be acceptable? Mr. Pelle stated he would like to hear from the community to get an opinion of that.

Mr. Emmons stated that this was a starting point; at this point we would have to go back and see if it fits into the direction of the \$1,400-1,500 rent. If the Board and the City do not want the expansion, then I will go back to the Board and work on the existing buildings to improve where we can. Nothing is cast in stone, we are open for suggestions; this is a proposed project. I was hoping we would find out something from the Jesuit Center about the documents mentioned at the last meeting, but I have not heard anything. We paid for a title search and nothing was discovered through that process that would prohibit construction. This is a paired down version from the 60-70 units that we started with. Mr. Huseman stated there clearly is a need to provide senior services somewhere in Milford. The purpose of tonight is to get everyone's comments and digest it to see if anything will work; I like the spirit of this living arrangement, it is a pastoral setting and not what you would see when driving out to Eastgate.

Jon Lenihan, 5364 S. Milford: I am directly at the bend in the road; my front yard is directly in front of their property. I have a vested interest in the outcome of this. My wife and I bought the property last December. I am here as a concerned resident and am voicing my opposition to the plan. This plan is not a minor addition to an existing facility; this is a doubling of the square footage at SEM Terrace. This is achieved by putting buildings into every open area. On November 2nd at the Neighborhood Meeting, it was the first opportunity that the neighbors had to see the plan from SEM, and it was unfortunate, because it became very clear that the folks from SEM equated any opposition of their development as a lack of support for affordable housing for the elderly; that could not be further from the truth. No one here is opposed to respectfully caring for people as they age. This is about the inappropriateness of a low cost, multi-unit housing development within an historic neighborhood. We moved here because we craved the green space and serenity; the accessibility and peacefulness of the South Milford neighborhood were impossible to resist as a place to establish roots, the historical charm and lack of housing density were some of the key factors in investing in Milford. Back 1994 a survey of the residents was conducted by the City that became a part of the Comprehensive Plan of that same year; the survey rated south Milford as the best neighborhood and most attractive in Milford. At the core of the discussion is the identity of a neighborhood and the city and a commentary on the direction we want to take for generations into the future. This development impacts the long term future of Milford by setting a precedent of the types of development we see in our city. What type of city do we want to create for our children and what will it look like 2-3 decades from now? Twenty years ago the Land Use Plan stated that one of the goals was to promote a strong, stable residential neighborhood that provides an attractive living environment for present and future residents and one of the bullets under that was to extend existing neighborhoods such as South Milford. This development does not include any of the character from the surrounding neighborhood; the buildings were designed to be low cost, low maintenance structures. Little attention was paid to aesthetic integration; they appear to be in keeping with the existing building on the property. Another goal of the 1997 Land Use Plan was to promote a high activity downtown with uses and amenities that capitalize and are sensitive to the historic character of the area. That same point was used as the basis for the objection to the Milford Main senior living development. There is nothing about this development that seeks to identify or preserve the character of the area. This is an immediate eyesore and blight on the neighborhood. Section 1127.04 of the Zoning Code includes guidelines for plan review by the Planning Commission which include: 1. a site that has an appearance of being congested, over built or cluttered can evolve into a blighting influence shall be avoided, and 2. Consistency of proposed building materials and design with the prevailing character of the area. It doesn't take a planner to see how over built and congested it would be on the property. The City's website states that the Planning Commission is charged with controlling growth, promoting economic health, and improving the quality of life for our residents; this development runs contrary to each one of those responsibilities. As members of the

Planning Commission you have an opportunity to uphold your responsibility to protect our neighborhoods and preserve our community by voting no to this overzealous expansion plan.

Sister Therese Gillman, Jesuit Center: I want to speak about three areas: safety, density, and aesthetic preservation. Having just journeyed with my own parents, I do value services to the elderly. Based on the SEM Terrace plans the occupancy will more than double the traffic and safety enhancements to accommodate the utilization by new residents, their families, visitors and employees. In a March 2016 Council meeting, Chief Baird reported the City has experienced a 20% increase in ems and fire runs that year and 1/3 of their runs were to the SEM complex and the city will need to decide very soon whether they will ask for a tax levy increase in the future. Without a proposed increase in ems and staff personnel, we are concerned about the safety of the people who come to the Jesuit Spiritual Center. We are concerned that the city may find itself without the appropriate level of safety personnel in the event of an emergency. I brought up the density issue at the November meeting because the need for these units came from phone calls, but there is no market study that states what the actual need is. If we look at the AARP studies on the late baby boomer generation that 9 out of 10 seniors prefer to grow old in their home. Recent research written by the National Conference of state Legislators with AARP states that nearly 90% of people over 65 want to stay in their homes and 80% believe that their current residence is where there residence will always be. I really question the need and when I met with them they said the occupancy over time is about 85%. I do believe all seniors deserve affordable housing, but I am unconvinced that this level of density is not appropriate for the scale and vision of the Milford community. The proposed development significantly alters the greenspace and landscaping associated with the neighborhood, and for over 90 years the people at the spiritual center come from around the country. They are drawn there because of the peace and tranquility; they value the aesthetic country feel. I shared the proposed plan with our Board and the statement made at the November meeting made by Mr. Emmons about using low cost products, but I say if we care about our seniors then let's use high quality products that can be sustained over time. Over time how will this property be used when the baby boomer population is no longer at its peak and decreases? On behalf of the Jesuit Spiritual Center I respectfully ask that you deny a permit to the SEM Terrace proposal as it is presented today.

Carl Samson, 233 Laurel: About a year ago SEM Villa II made decision that all the stakeholders nearby institutional and otherwise were not to be informed or brought in to the discussion of why or how they wanted to expand their operation. The surprise 10 day notice before the Planning Commission meeting put everyone back on their heels and here we are. It is not how you do business, you bring people in, you tell them what you want to do and ask for input and then you move forward. Valley View was a result of a number of people who sought to preserve land owned by a developer who wanted to build 350 homes. We believed as a community that we deserved better. We formed a nonprofit and raised money, a consensus developed around the idea of a nature center and 15 years later we have a jewel in the crown of Milford and an asset regularly used by thousands of people of all ages. Valley View is a powerful magnet for those who want to live in a community that values peace and tranquility afforded by open space and a strong connection to nature. I also believe it is a strong intangible benefit that has helped drive Milford's economic boom. The downtown is thriving and many residents are adding additions onto homes. This plan to shoehorn 15 buildings into every nook and cranny at SEM Terrace is equally short sighted. There is a significant difference between living peacefully with room to breathe and walk with open space and very few cars, and simply being housed. I respectfully ask the Planning Commission not approve this plan; it is wrong for the future of Milford, it is wrong for the 90 year old retreat center, and I believe it is wrong for seniors too.

Tom Wagner, 5392 South Milford: Being a real estate agent we always talk about location, and home or house. South Milford is considered a home, we are not just buying a brick and mortar house. Most who have bought a home here would agree that their primary motivation is location. With respect to property values any infrastructure development impacts the demand that equates to value and pricing. We have to be very careful with any infrastructure development within a neighborhood because it affects property

values and the demand for people moving into this area. We are talking about traffic studies and the amount of traffic that flows up and down south Milford, Cleveland, Mound, and spilling into Laurel Avenue; the traffic has increased exponentially and it is going to increase more with this and I think we are maxed out now. The canoe livery on Round Bottom Road has added more vehicles; they have two school buses running around the clock during nice weather. They have two vans with canoes on their back so we have additional traffic. Please consider voting no for this development.

Father Paul Macke, Jesuit Center: The Jesuits have a rich 90 year history here in Milford providing spiritual renewal, and education to people all over the country and internationally. We have over 14,000 people a year come to these serene grounds for peace and solitude and many of our guests are youth from all over the area. Our guests value the atmosphere that the town of Milford provides. The relationship between the Jesuit Center and SEM became official on October 5, 1971 at that time 55 acres were sold to SEM Villa Inc. At the time of the sale the SEM mission was viewed as compatible with the mission of the Jesuit Center. Our mission was to serve the people of God in the area, we thought by selling the property to SEM Villa Inc it would serve the needs of our senior citizens and our missions would be compatible. We still believe we can have a compatible mission, but what's developed since then without our knowledge is that we sold to one corporation and now it is five nonprofits independently operated and there seems to be no master plan for the whole group. When we inquired with the various parts of SEM they don't know about the others plans. We have five independent nonprofit organizations with no general master development plan and that concerns us. It concerns us deeply that an expansion of this magnitude and density greatly impedes the aesthetic natural beauty, particularly the portion that abuts our property. Mature trees would be replaced with young trees that would take years to grow. Our hope is that Jesuit Spiritual Center can continue its mission for future generations. The proposed development of SEM Terrace would have a significant negative impact on the privacy of our retreatants, thus potentially decreasing the impact we have of providing people an opportunity to seek peace and solitude. I was here at the public hearing and it concerns me how this was approached, we considered ourselves to be good neighbors with SEM, but we found out about this expansion from the city with a two week notice. At the meeting Dave Emmons said if the neighbors did not want it, he would take it off the table and even delay this process, and yet we are here tonight. We are surprised that our neighbor is pushing this forward without much dialogue. I urge you to vote no on this proposal.

Len Harding, 222 Cleveland: I think some of the things we are not looking at here are that when SEM moved in many years ago the idea was to have nice bucolic, suburban place to send mom. South Milford was an advertising tool for SEM. It has been a symbiotic relationship; by and large SEM has been a very good neighbor. It is well kept, and clean. At some point SEM owes us something too. We provide a neighborhood that everyone loves to drive through. When you talk about adding senior citizens, you are talking about increased ems runs, they use heavy trucks. We have torn up roadway on Cleveland all the time. There is a sewer out there that leaks all winter. What we really need are better roads and better infrastructure. It is not clear to me why this needs to be built in the first place. The building material does not look like long lived material. Adding a parking lot is going to increase storm water runoff. I just don't see the need. The City isn't ready for it, the residents don't want it and I don't see the pressing need for SEM.

Sean Reynolds, 102 Cleveland: The integrity of the neighborhood is compromised with this and it is pretty clear. I witness dozens of ems runs and I can't even imagine what this will be like with these additional units. It's impossible to believe the traffic numbers as presented. Once the new facility is built the traffic patterns will be unbelievable. The period of time it will take to develop this and the traffic and construction that will be in our neighborhood would be unbelievable. The Commission is bound and committed to serving the community, based on the guidelines outlined 20 years ago. It is your duty to shut this down.

Becky Linser, 134 Cleveland: We are all talking about the community around SEM and the spiritual center next to SEM and the fact that the property was sold to SEM by the spiritual center with a degree of trust that the property would be maintained with what you set out to do at that time. The branding, the beauty and the charm, it is so beautiful and this is who you are now; this project is not who you are. You will destroy your own brand not just the community around you.

Michael Heferin, 15 Cleveland: There are not many communities like this, you can't make a 100 year old community but you can destroy it quickly. Be careful, this is a special place.

Vicky Phillips, 154 Mound: My husband and I run down South Milford in the morning; if we aren't on South Milford by 5:45, we can't go that way. The ems runs seem to be before breakfast time. The delivery trucks back into SEM Haven about 5:00AM. I just wanted to share that personal perspective.

Kathy Shafer, 5338 S. Milford: I have a feeling that current residents of SEM Laurel & SEM Terrace may want to move into these new condos which will leave spaces in the existing buildings that will then need to be filled. It will be harder to fill these older spaces. The tail end of the baby boomers will be the target to move in, and after that there is a severe drop in population. We then have low quality housing that is sitting there in 15-20 years.

Deborah Floyd, 39 Cleveland: I want to address the traffic issue as well. The quality of life because of that traffic has been diminished. It shouldn't take me that long to get out of my driveway in the morning; I have to wait until a school bus comes, because it stops the traffic long enough so that I can cross the street.

Ms. Howland, Mayor, stated that she was very impressed with the comments from the neighborhood. I am thrilled when citizens get involved and care about their community. To SEM, I appreciate your investment in the community and your mission to take care of the elderly. I did a lot of research on senior living during the Milford Main project and it is a tricky market. More people are deciding to stay at home, it becomes cost prohibitive to move out but your marketing plan is not my concern. My concern is the residents because the decisions we make today have an impact 20 years into the future and we have to take that into consideration. In my mind this is overdevelopment and that's not fair to the residents and the integrity of South Milford. As South Milford goes so does Main Street; we have a thriving Main Street and they go hand in hand. I implore you to go back to the drawing table because there are so many opposed to it; I also received a phone call from Terrace Park Country Club and they are opposed to it as well. There is an overwhelming opposition to this and I hope you will respect and realize that it is time to reconsider some aspects. You and the people you have hired to draw this will be gone, but these people will still be living there and dealing with the repercussions that this development will have on their community. If you decide to redraw the plan and reduce the density, then meet with these people to find out what works, bring them options. We had a recent case before Planning Commission and the company had built stores elsewhere but what they were looking to build in Milford was cheap and I was insulted. As a city we have to insist on better quality materials and better designs. I am also concerned about the city's rental rates; our rental rate is through the rough. The Steering Committee met for six months specifically to update that. The things you find in the Comprehensive Plan that you feel this violates came out during the process. We want a brand and image and hold fast to the integrity of that image; that came out very strong in the Steering Committee, and for us as a commission not to heed would be all of us doing a disservice to the city. '

Mr. Huseman stated that this item will be placed on the January Planning Commission agenda.

Mr. Pelle made a motion to defer this item to the January Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Roe seconded the motion. The ayes carried.

Ms. Holbrook entered the Staff Report for SITE 17-13 Wyler Conditional Use into the record:

Project: Wyler Fast Lane LLC
Location: 401 Milford Parkway
Property Owner: The Mountain Agency 401 LLC
401 Milford Parkway, Ste A
Milford, OH 45150
Applicant: Same
Acreage: 33 Acres
Tax Parcel Id: 210737.085
Zoning: L-I, Light Industry District, Planned Development
Use: Automotive Leasing

ADJACENT LAND USE AND ZONING

Surrounding property:

North, East, and South: Light Industry District

West: Institutional District

ANALYSIS

Brian McNair, representing Wyler Automotive, is requesting permission to operate a car rental leasing office located at their existing offices at 401 Milford Parkway. The property is zoned L-I, Light Industry, Planned Development. Automotive sales and leasing is permitted in this district as a conditional use if expressly authorized by the Planning Commission, and in accordance with Chapter 1195.04.

The applicant proposes to maintain a fleet of thirty vehicles available on site that would be available to customers subscribing to their monthly motor vehicle subscription leasing program.

Automotive Sales is defined as “any building or land used for the display, sale or rental of new or used motor vehicles or trailers in operable condition and where no repair work is done.” Chapter 1194.04.D. identifies the following conditions as it applies to Auto Sales and Leasing:

D. Automotive Sales

1. No structure shall exceed 35 feet in height.
2. All structures and activity areas, except off-street parking, shall be located no less than 40 feet from all lot lines.
3. There shall be no more than two ingress/egress drives onto the property. No drive shall exceed 35 feet in width.
4. All points of ingress/egress shall be located as far as practically possible from intersections of two or more major thoroughfares.
5. Any repair shop or establishment that is accessory to the sale of motor vehicles shall meet the conditional requirements of Automotive Repair Establishments.

6. Lubrication and other incidental servicing other than washing of motor vehicles and all supply and merchandise storage shall be completely within an enclosed building except as otherwise provided herein.
7. Lighting, including permitted illuminated signs, shall be arranged so as not to reflect or cause glare that would constitute a nuisance to any residential use or hazard to traffic on any public thoroughfare.
8. Employee vehicles and vehicles awaiting servicing or return to customers following servicing shall be parked in areas indicated for such parking on the approved site plan.
9. Parking areas and vehicle display areas shall not encroach upon any bufferyard required in Chapter 1189, Landscaping and Bufferyard Requirements.

This is an existing site and no expansion of the structure or parking area is proposed. Repair work will not be performed on site.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends approval of the conditional use application.


Mr. McNair stated that this is a new concept which started in Atlanta with a company named Clutch. We will be the first dealership/company in the Midwest that is trying this. It is a subscription agreement or club that will have 30-40 members and the members will have a choice of about 30 vehicles in the fleet. The vehicles could include a Corvette, Cadillac, SUV, truck, etc. You can flip out of a vehicle at any time. For a monthly fee you will have access to these vehicles at any time. Wyler Fast Lane will have an existing office at the 401 Milford Parkway building and an individual will be in charge of it; however, what we will really be doing is storing the vehicles there until a vehicle is called into service by a member. There will not be public coming to the building, all transactions will happen through a mobile app. Once a member selects their vehicle, the vehicle will be dropped off to the member.

This is the first phase or a Tier One, and if successful we will add another tier of vehicles that will be available. The monthly fee includes your auto insurance and all taxes. The program or target market is geared toward empty nesters or families with teenagers. Typically people flip approximately six times a year. There will not even be a sign at the Milford Parkway location.

Ms. Howland made a motion to approve the conditional use permitting automotive leasing. Mr. Roe seconded the motion. The ayes carried.

There being no further business or comments to come before the Planning Commission, Ms. Howland made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:45 pm; seconded by Mr. Pelle. Following a unanimous decision, the ayes carried.


Assistant City Manager


Mike Huseman, Vice Chair