

Minutes of the City of Vandalia Planning Commission
July 8, 2025

Members Present:	Ms. Kristin Cox, Mr. Lucious Plant, Mr. Bob Hussong
Members Absent:	Mr. Dave Arnold
Staff Present:	Michael Hammes, City Planner Ben Graham, Zoning & Planning Coordinator Ben Borton, Director of Public Service Rob Cron, Assistant City Manager
Others Present:	Greg Thurman, John Seagraves, Rick Drake, Jovi Takhar, Boydon Boston, Steve Ponscheck, Ron Miller, Brian Wertz, Aaron Horn, Rob Smith, Ryan Lefeld, Trisha Cortes, Orlando Cortes, Don Donathan, Ed Burke, Missi Demoss, Nelson Demoss, David Whitlock

Call to Order

Ms. Cox called the meeting to order at 6:08 p.m.

Attendance

Ms. Cox noted that three members were present. Mr. Plant made a motion to excuse Mr. Arnold. Mr. Hussong seconded. The motion carried 3-0.

Approval of Minutes of the Planning Commission

Mr. Hussong made a motion to approve the May 13th, 2025 minutes. Mr. Plant seconded the motion. The motion carried 3-0.

Swearing in of Attendees Wishing to Speak at Meeting

The attendees were sworn in.

Old Business

Mr. Hammes confirmed that there was no Old Business on the agenda.

New Business – PC 25-0007 – PUD Amendment and Preliminary Plan – Redwood Phase III

Mr. Hammes introduced Case PC 25-0007. Todd Foley, of POD Design, and on behalf of Redwood Vandalia, requests a Major Amendment to an existing Planned Unit Development and approval of a revised PUD Preliminary Plan. The request involves two parcels totaling 27.59 acres +/-, located along the east side of Webster Street at Park Center Drive in the City of Vandalia. If approved, the proposed amendment would facilitate the construction of 59 multi-family residential units as part of Phase III of the Redwood Vandalia development. The property is owned by Redwood Vandalia.

Mr. Hammes described the history of the Redwood Vandalia PUD. He noted that the Redwood development was originally approved in 2019 as a mixed-use commercial and multi-family residential development. Phases I and II of the Redwood development feature 171 multi-family units. Phase I was completed in 2024, and Phase II is under construction.

Mr. Hammes explained that two additional parcels were set aside for commercial uses fitting the standards of the Office / Industrial Park district. Parcel 3, located south of Park Center Drive, was approved for an assisted living facility in 2022. That project was later cancelled. Redwood Vandalia now seeks to expand into a Phase III on this parcel.

Mr. Hammes discussed the proposed amendment to the Redwood Vandalia PUD. He explained that the applicant wished to add “Multi-Family Residential” as a permitted use on parcels 2 and 3. Because this change would increase the number of dwelling units in the development, it qualifies as a Major Amendment and requires Council approval. This change is the only change to the PUD standards proposed.

Mr. Hammes reviewed the revised Preliminary Plan for Phase III. He noted that the proposed residential buildings would be similar in architectural style and design to the homes built in Phases I and II. While the development would continue to primarily feature two-bedroom units, a limited number of one-bedroom and three-bedroom units are also included in the plan for Phase III. He also discussed signage along Park Center Drive, stating that a blade sign depicted in the proposal would be replaced by a permanent sign to comply with the City’s signage regulations. Importantly, Mr. Hammes clarified that the current Preliminary Plan applies only to Parcel 3, and any future development of Parcel 2 would require a separate plan amendment.

Mr. Hammes discussed the Comprehensive Plan. He explained that the area was designated as “Neighborhood Commercial”, owing to the proposed uses available at the time the plan was drafted. Had Phase III been proposed initially, rather than the assisted living facility or some related use, the site would have been designated “Medium Density Residential” to match the first two phases of the Redwood development. As such, the proposed Phase III is consistent with the goals of the plan, if not the specific designation.

Mr. Hammes reported that the development would be managed by Redwood as a rental community, so there would be no covenants or homeowners’ association.

Mr. Hammes noted that the standards that applied to the initial phases of the development would apply to residential development in this area, with the exception of a required buffer area at the southwest end of Phases I and II (since that buffer already exists).

Mr. Hammes reported that construction was expected in late 2026, following the completion of Phase II. The proposed phasing plan for this site would see construction completed in 2028.

Mr. Hussong asked about the density of Phase III, referencing the number of dwelling units and the different unit sizes. Mr. Hammes replied that the preliminary plan refers to dwelling units in the aggregate, with the calculation of density taking only the raw number of units into account. The Final Plan approval would be where the applicant would need to show specific utility capacities and designs.

Ms. Cox opened the public portion of the meeting, and invited the applicant forward.

Mr. Greg Thurman of Redwood Vandalia addressed the Commission on behalf of the applicant. He confirmed that the number of bedrooms in Phase III would be the equivalent of 59 two-bedroom units, and that the number of one-bedroom units would balance out the number of three-bedroom units.

Mr. Thurman reported that Phase I was 99% leased, with a waiting list for Phases I and II. With the decline of assisted living facilities following the COVID pandemic, the Provision Living agreement had been cancelled. With parcel 3 now available, the expansion of the Redwood development is now a viable option on this site.

Ms. Cox asked about parcel 2, which would also be approved for multi-family residential uses if the amendment is approved. Mr. Thurman replied that there were no plans for a Phase IV at this time, due to the topography of the site. If a small development is proposed for that site in the future, amending the PUD now would remove the need to seek a second amendment at that time.

Hearing no further public comment, Ms. Cox closed the public portion of the meeting.

Review Criteria

Ms. Cox explained that the Commission would discuss the Preliminary Plan review criteria. Major amendments rely on the criteria for either preliminary or final plans, depending on the amendment in question, so only one set of criteria would be reviewed.

The Planning Commission shall not recommend in favor of, and City Council shall not approve, a preliminary plan for a planned unit development unless each body finds that the preliminary plan does the following:

- A. The proposed development is consistent with the Official Thoroughfare Plan, the Comprehensive Plan and other applicable plans and policies of the City of Vandalia;

Staff Comment: Staff feels that the proposed Planned Unit Development, in its current form, is consistent with the City's goals and policies. Staff notes that any inconsistencies with the Comprehensive Plan are justified given current conditions in the vicinity.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- B. The proposed development could be substantially completed within the period of time specified in the schedule of development submitted by the applicant;

Staff Comment: Staff feels that the proposed schedule of development is reasonable and achievable.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- C. The proposed development provides accessibility to public roads that are adequate to carry the traffic that shall be imposed upon them by the proposed development; that the number of vehicular access points to public roads from high traffic generating uses are minimized to limit the number traffic conflict points; and that the streets and driveways on the site of the proposed development shall be adequate to serve the users of the proposed development;

Staff Comment: Staff feels that the design of the proposed development meets this criterion.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- D. The proposed development shall not impose an undue burden on public services such as utilities, fire, school and police protection;

Staff Comment: Staff feels that the proposed development complies with this review criterion.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- E. The proposed development contains such proposed covenants, easements and other provisions relating to the proposed development standards as reasonably may be required for the public health, safety and welfare;

Staff Comment: Staff feels that the proposed development complies with this review criterion.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- F. The proposed development shall include adequate open space, landscaping, screening and other improvements;

Staff Comment: Staff feels that the proposed development complies with this review criterion.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- G. The location and arrangement of signs, structures, parking and loading areas, material/waste storage, walks, lighting and related facilities shall be compatible with existing and future uses both within and adjoining the proposed development;

Staff Comment: Staff feels that the proposed development complies with this review criterion.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- H. The proposed development shall preserve natural features such as watercourses, trees and rock outcrops, to the degree possible, so that they can enhance the overall design of the PUD;

Staff Comment: Noting the areas designated as open space and the preservation of natural vegetation in those areas, particularly to the east, Staff feels that the proposed development complies with this review criterion.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- I. The proposed development is designed to take advantage of the existing land contours in order to provide satisfactory road gradients and suitable building lots and to facilitate the provision of proposed services;

Staff Comment: Staff feels that the proposed development complies with this review criterion.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- J. The proposed development shall not create excessive additional requirements for public facilities and services at public cost;

Staff Comment: Staff feels that the proposed development complies with this review criterion.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- K. The proposed development shall not involve uses, activities, layout and building designs that are detrimental to the use of both the proposed facilities and/or nearby properties by reason of excessive traffic, noise or vibration, storm water flooding, air or water emissions, objectionable glare or lack of proper regard for privacy;

Staff Comment: Noting that the only proposed uses are residential in character or passive open space uses, Staff feels that the proposed development complies with this review criterion.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- L. The proposed development has buildings designed with sufficient architectural variety and exterior surface complexity but including elements which serve to visually unify the development;

Staff Comment: While the proposed structures for this development are similar in style to the other homes built in Subarea C, Staff feels that the updated exteriors provide sufficient variety to comply with this review criterion.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- M. The proposed development has minimized the size of paved areas or provided adequate visual relief through the use of landscaped islands while providing adequate parking.

Staff Comment: As no standalone parking lots or vehicular use areas are proposed, Staff feels that this review criterion does not apply.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

Recommendation

Ms. Cox reported that Staff recommended Approval of the proposed Major Amendment to the Redwood Vandalia Planned Unit Development. Mr. Plant made a motion to recommend approval. Mr. Hussong seconded.

By a vote of 3-0, the Planning Commission recommended **Approval** of the proposed Major Amendment.

Ms. Cox reported that Staff recommended Approval of the proposed Preliminary Plan for Phase III of the Redwood Vandalia development. Mr. Hussong made a motion to recommend approval. Mr. Plant seconded.

By a vote of 3-0, the Planning Commission recommended **Approval** of the proposed Preliminary Plan.

Ms. Cox noted that the recommendations of the Commission would next be reviewed at the Council Study Session on Monday, July 21st, 2025.

**New Business – PC 25-0008 – Planned Unit Development and Preliminary Plan
Towns at Cassel Grove (600 Corporate Center Drive)**

Mr. Hammes introduced Case PC 25-0008. Jeff Puthoff, P.E., of Choice One Engineering, on behalf of DR Horton, requests a change of zoning as previously established by the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Vandalia. The request involves one parcel totaling 14.494 acres +/- located at the south end of Corporate Center Drive in the City of Vandalia. As proposed, the subject property would be rezoned from the O - Office district to a Residential Planned Unit Development. The property is owned by the Hague Corporation.

Mr. Hammes described the proposed subdivision, noting that the 72 homes in this neighborhood would be a detached townhome design. This affords homeowners the advantages of a single-family lot, with rear and side yards, while still providing a unique townhome aesthetic.

Mr. Hammes discussed the history of the site, explaining that the parcel was one of the few parcels in the City with the O – Office zoning. The parcel had been zoned to O – Office several decades ago, with the intent of building an office building or office complex. No such development ever happened, and a large-scale office development is less likely in 2025 than it would have been in decades past. The owners of the property had identified this Medium-Density Residential development had been identified as a viable alternative use.

Mr. Hammes discussed the Airport Environs Overlay (AEO) as applied to this parcel. He noted that the parcel was south of the 70 DNL area, which would prevent the construction of Single-Family homes. The 65 DNL area, which encompasses almost the entire site, permits Single-Family Residential development of the type proposed. There are no issues with the AEO that would prevent the proposed development.

Mr. Hammes described the lot design. He reported that the proposed lots had a minimum width of 35 feet. This is larger than the lot width for attached townhomes (22'), but narrower than the typical width for single-family homes in the RSF-4 district (55').

Mr. Hammes noted that one lot at the northeast end of the site would be reserved for a model home.

Mr. Hammes described the proposed green space, noting that the entire site would have an open space buffer between this development and adjacent properties. There would also be a buffer between Phases I and II of the development. A small tot lot is reserved at the northwest end of the site. A 40-foot buffer would be preserved to the east, between this development and the homes on Damian Street.

Mr. Hammes discussed the density of the proposed development. He explained that the development would have 4.96 dwellings per acre. The Zoning Code requires single-family residential PUDs to have fewer than 6 dwellings per acre. Attached townhomes would need to meet the multi-family standard of 12 dwellings per acre, making this development less dense than the alternative.

Mr. Hammes described the roadways proposed for the development. The existing cul-de-sac at Corporate Center Drive would be removed in favor of two side streets with three cul-de-sacs. The Fire Division has reviewed the layout, and has no objections to the proposed design with regards to emergency access. All roads would be public right-of-way.

Mr. Hammes added that there would be no road connection to Pool Avenue. A pedestrian walkway would be provided at the north end of the site, connecting this development to the existing neighborhood to the east.

Mr. Hammes discussed the Comprehensive Plan. He explained that the area was designated as “Neighborhood Commercial” due to the O – Office zoning, and that all O – Office parcels in the City were designated as Neighborhood Commercial. In this case, the parcel does not have the interconnectivity or access to fit the intent of the Neighborhood Commercial designation, and the business types intended for that designation would not be viable on this property. Further, the proposed Medium Density Residential use would be consistent with the Medium Density Residential neighborhood to the east. In closing, Mr. Hammes stated his view that the proposed development was consistent with the goals and intent of the Comprehensive Plan if not the specific designation.

Mr. Hammes listed the permitted uses for the site. Single-Family Residential homes would only be permitted on the numbered building lots. Passive open space uses would be permitted on all lots in the development, and accessory uses would be permitted as required by the code.

Mr. Hammes discussed the development standards for the development. He explained that the building lots would be 35 feet in width with 25-foot front and rear yards. Side yards would be set at a minimum of 5.5 feet, which would create at least 10 feet of distance between homes. Open Space lots would have different standards, locking them into at least 1 acre in size. The tot lot would be a 55-foot lot, as proposed.

Mr. Hammes explained that single-family residential PUDs generally include requirements for different home styles and colors, in order to encourage variety in designs and break up monotony. All garages would be required to accommodate two vehicles. Architectural Standards not set by the PUD would default to the standards of the RSF-2 district.

Mr. Hammes discussed the remaining standards for the development. Several corner lots would be oriented to match adjacent homes, and any lots on curves would have their frontage measured at the setback line as is standard for cul-de-sac lots. Other standards not set by the PUD (such as lot design) would default to the standards of the RMF district, owing to the size of the lots proposed here.

Mr. Hussong acknowledged that living near an airport is something that residents in this area are used to dealing with.

Mr. Hussong expressed concern over access within the development, given that there is only one path in and out of the development. In the event of an emergency, residents who need to leave might not be able to get past emergency equipment and first responders.

Mr. Hammes replied that the code did not require a second exit, based on the level of traffic expected from the development. Further, he noted that the vicinity did not lend itself to an additional exit. Mr. Hussong replied that the site does need to be developed, but that he wanted to make sure the issue with access to and from the site was being reviewed. Mr. Hammes confirmed that staff would review that issue and identify alternatives.

Mr. Plant asked about the target buyer for these homes. Ms. Cox invited the applicant to the podium.

Mr. Rob Smith, with DR Horton, addressed the Commission as applicant. He thanked the Commission for considering the application. He described DR Horton as “America’s Homebuilder”, and noted that the company was excited to expand into Southwest Ohio. The company has built communities in Clayton, Xenia, New Carlisle, Huber Heights, and new communities in Troy and Butler Township.

Mr. Smith added that the company had been in Ohio for five years. His office, based in Cincinnati, serves the Cincinnati and Dayton markets. The company staffs its offices with local employees who know the area and are familiar with the local community.

Mr. Smith explained that their initial proposal for this site involved traditional attached townhomes. The detached townhome product had seen some success in other markets, offering the best of both worlds, and the proposal was revised to offer this new type of home. The detached townhome offers the best of both worlds, with a townhome style of home and the private backyard.

Mr. Smith confirmed that his company would be willing to work with the City to expand the pedestrian walkway with bollards and other upgrades, so that the walkway could serve as an emergency access (or egress) if needed.

Mr. Aaron Horn, of DR Horton, added that the company had provided a packet of information about the development. He thanked staff for the detailed presentation.

Ms. Cox, echoing Mr. Plant’s earlier question, asked about the target audience for this type of home. Mr. Horn replied that these homes were targeted to buyers who want a smaller property to maintain and who may not want to share walls with their neighbors. Empty nesters and young urban professionals were mentioned as two target demographics. He added that families with dogs prefer having a fenced-in backyard (as opposed to a shared common backyard).

Mr. Smith added that some families may also take an interest in the site, noting that easy pedestrian access to nearby parks would benefit families with young children.

Mr. Plant asked about the idea of empty nesters buying homes with two stories. Mr. Smith replied that some empty nesters were comfortable with having a single staircase. He suggested that this unique product will find unique buyers who see that this product fits their lifestyle.

Ms. Cox asked about the location of the development and whether its isolated location or its proximity to the airport could cause problems. Mr. Smith replied that job growth in the area and proximity to the highway would highlight this as a safe, relatively affordable development in a strategic location.

Mr. Horn added that the neighborhood would be designed so as to set it apart from the adjacent properties. He discussed the green space provided in the plan and the pedestrian access to Pool Ave.

Mr. Hussong asked for clarification on the walkability. Mr. Horn replied that the Helke Park area, including recently upgraded pickleball courts, would be a major amenity for residents in this development.

Ms. Cox asked about buffering around the site. Mr. Horn referred to the Landscaping Plan, discussing the proposed plantings at the edges of the property. He noted that some areas were considered wetlands, which limited what they could plant. He pointed out that the plan called for preserving as much mature growth (including trees) as possible.

Mr. Smith added that a buffer area would be preserved along the east side of the development. His company's interest is in making every lot viable, so that they do not have unsold property.

Ms. Cox asked about the price point for the proposed homes. Mr. Smith replied that these homes in the current market would sell in the \$270,000 to \$310,000 price range. He reiterated his company's position that there is a market for homes in this price range.

Hearing no further questions from the Commission, Ms. Cox opened the public portion of the meeting.

Mr. John Seagraves of 3353 Hertlein Lane, addressed the Commission. He explained that he was one of several residents who negotiated the zoning to O-2 when the owner at the time wanted Industrial. There was work done at that time that was not allowed, and he and his neighbors have fought that for a long time. He added that he and his neighbors have septic systems.

Mr. Seagraves challenged the prices offered by the applicant. He argued that the property would be ideal for a medical office, and that medical companies in the region are eager to build new medical offices. He suggested that the owners of the property had not properly marketed the site, which is why it had not sold.

Mr. Seagraves argued that no empty nester would buy a home with a staircase.

Mr. Seagraves reported that he had not received a letter 40 years ago, and that he had not received a letter for this meeting. He thanked his neighbor for letting him know about the meeting. He added that his wife is in the hospital, and that he would be leaving once he concluded his remarks.

Mr. Seagraves stated that he had grown up in West Virginia, and that the proposed homes resembled "company homes".

Mr. Seagraves argued that the site had not been maintained, and that the City had not required them to properly maintain their land. When the current owner bought the property, they were aware that the land was zoned O-2.

Mr. Seagraves noted that he has emergency vehicles on his street every day.

Mr. Seagraves discussed water issues with the property. He said that the development of the site would send water into his backyard. As a real estate agent, he argued that the property would not be marketable.

Mr. Seagraves asked if the City had investigated the builder, arguing that the company has been involved in a number of lawsuits in other states.

Mr. Seagraves asked the Commission to turn down the application. He argued that the homes built on this site should match the homes on Damian Street. Any development on the site should match the current zoning.

Mr. Donnie Donathan of 515 Damian Street, addressed the Commission. He reminded the Commission that he had opposed a previous proposal for industrial zoning on this property, and that he opposes this rezoning. He displayed a petition of residents in the area who also opposed the development.

Mr. Donathan requested that Mr. Hammes stop receiving illegitimate proposals. He argued that the City should have rejected the application outright due to the number of homes proposed.

Mr. Donathan stepped away from the podium to refer to the displayed map of the proposed development. He argued that, if developed, the site would send a large amount of stormwater into his property and the properties of his neighbors. He reported that the area behind his home retained water due to poorly designed storm drains. He complained that the City had ignored his complaints about the issue.

Mr. Donathan argued that the current owners have not maintained the property, and that a new owner should be required to do so.

Mr. Donathan discussed drainage issues from 23 years ago along Pool Avenue and Damian Street.

Mr. Donathan argued that the stormwater for the development would flood his basement when the retention area overflows.

Mr. Donathan argued that Mr. Hammes should have rejected this proposal due to his stormwater concerns.

Mr. Donathan suggested that he could buy one of these homes for \$200,000 and rent it out as an Air BNB. He argued that no one would pay that much for homes near the airport and Tackett Trees.

Mr. Donathan stated that he wanted this development stopped. He stated that his petition featured over 30 signatures, and that he had prevented spouses and children from signing – one signature per address only.

Mr. Donathan argued that the Homeowners' Association would become bankrupt, and that kids could drown in the retention areas if no one maintains the site.

Mr. Donathan argued that he has an ownership interest in the fifty-foot area behind his house, because he had maintained it for fifty years.

Mr. Donathan asked for nice homes on the property, preferring homes that would sell for \$450,000.

Stepping away from the podium, Mr. Donathan encouraged the audience to sign the petition.

Hearing no further comments, Ms. Cox closed the public meeting.

Mr. Plant asked the applicant to address the stormwater concerns. Mr. Smith replied that he expected some concern from adjacent property owners about the stormwater. In general, his company intends to improve the site and the stormwater flow within the area. He introduced his engineer to address the details of their proposal.

Mr. Ryan Lefeld, with Choice One Engineering, addressed the Commission. The retention ponds proposed are there for stormwater management and treatment. The requirement is that stormwater is analyzed both before and after the proposed development, and that the development cannot release more stormwater than the current level of the site.

Mr. Lefeld reported that the development has to follow normal downstream flow for stormwater, and that no drainage can be directed into neighboring backyards or other properties.

Mr. Hussong asked about the Carriage Hills development in Huber Heights. Mr. Smith replied that his company had done a small part of that development.

Mr. Plant asked for clarification about the stormwater. Mr. Lefeld replied that stormwater may currently run over the ground into adjacent properties. Once the development is in place, water that comes from the development would be directed to the proposed ponds, which would then outlet into the storm sewer system. The storm water that normally goes into backyards would be intercepted before it reaches adjacent properties.

Ms. Cox asked if the roadway design would impact stormwater. Mr. Hammes replied that the roadways would be public roadways, and as such they would need to comply with City and Ohio EPA standards for stormwater. Mr. Lefeld added that the City has additional standards in their Stormwater Protection Plan that would govern the site.

Mr. Graham added that the roadways were designed to be wider than standard. Mr. Cron confirmed this, noting that the 37' width proposed is six feet wider than the usual 31' standard.

Mr. Plant expressed concern about the traffic flow within the development, noting that the design of the site may result in on-street parking that could restrict traffic flow.

Hearing no further comments, Ms. Cox moved on to the Review Criteria.

Planned Unit Development District Review Criteria

Recommendations and decisions on Planned Unit Development applications shall be based on consideration of the following review criteria. Not all criteria may be applicable in each case, and each case shall be determined on its own facts.

- (1) The proposed amendment will further the purposes of this overall code;

Staff Comment: Staff feels that the proposed Planned Unit Development furthers the purposes of the code.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- (2) The proposed amendment and proposed uses are consistent with the City's adopted plans, goals and policies;

Staff Comment: Staff feels that the proposed Planned Unit Development, in its current form, is consistent with the City's goals and policies. Staff notes that any inconsistencies with the Comprehensive Plan are justified given current conditions in the vicinity.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- (3) The proposed amendment is necessary or desirable because of changing conditions, new planning concepts, or other social or economic conditions;

Staff Comment: Staff feels that the proposed Planned Unit Development is necessary to accommodate the style of home intended for this site. The detached townhome-style structures proposed would not be feasible in a standard zoning district.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- (4) The public facilities such as transportation, utilities, and other required public services will be adequate to serve the proposed use;

Staff Comment: Staff feels that the site has adequate access to transportation, utilities, and other required public services.

Mr. Plant and Ms. Cox agreed with the staff comment. Mr. Hussong disagreed. The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 2-1.

- (5) The proposed rezoning will not adversely affect the economic viability of existing developed and vacant land within the City;

Staff Comment: Given the location and nature of the proposed development, Staff feels that the proposed development complies with this review criterion.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- (6) The proposed amendment is not likely to result in significant adverse impacts upon the natural environment, including air, water, noise, storm water management, wildlife, and vegetation, or such impacts will be substantially mitigated;

Staff Comment: Given the proposed preservation of green space as part of this development, Staff feels that the proposed Planned Unit Development complies with this review criteria.

Mr. Hammes noted that the project is required to have no negative impact on the vicinity with regards to storm water management, and that the staff comment reflects that requirement.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- (7) The proposed amendment will not constitute an instance where special treatment is given to a particular property or property owner that would not be applicable to a similar property, under the same circumstances;

Staff Comment: Staff feels that the proposed zoning is justified on the merits, and does not constitute special treatment.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- (8) The proposed amendment would correct an error in the application of this Planning and Zoning Code as applied to the subject property.

Staff Comment: Staff feels that this criterion does not apply.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

Preliminary Plan Review Criteria

The Planning Commission shall not recommend in favor of, and City Council shall not approve, a preliminary plan for a planned unit development unless each body respectively finds that the preliminary plan does the following:

- A. The proposed development is consistent with the Official Thoroughfare Plan, the Comprehensive Plan and other applicable plans and policies of the City of Vandalia;

Staff Comment: Staff feels that the proposed Planned Unit Development, in its current form, is consistent with the City's goals and policies. Staff notes that any inconsistencies with the Comprehensive Plan are justified given current conditions in the vicinity.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- B. The proposed development could be substantially completed within the period of time specified in the schedule of development submitted by the applicant;

Staff Comment: Staff feels that the proposed schedule of development is reasonable and achievable.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- C. The proposed development provides accessibility to public roads that are adequate to carry the traffic that shall be imposed upon them by the proposed development; that the number of vehicular access points to public roads from high traffic generating uses are minimized to limit the number traffic conflict points; and that the streets and driveways on the site of the proposed development shall be adequate to serve the users of the proposed development;

Staff Comment: Staff feels that the design of the proposed development meets this criterion.

Ms. Cox agreed with the staff comment. Mr. Hussong and Mr. Plant disagreed. The Planning Commission disagreed with the staff comment by a vote of 2-1.

- D. The proposed development shall not impose an undue burden on public services such as utilities, fire, school and police protection;

Staff Comment: Staff feels that the proposed development complies with this review criterion.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- E. The proposed development contains such proposed covenants, easements and other provisions relating to the proposed development standards as reasonably may be required for the public health, safety and welfare;

Staff Comment: Staff feels that the proposed development complies with this review criterion.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- F. The proposed development shall include adequate open space, landscaping, screening and other improvements;

Staff Comment: Staff feels that the proposed development complies with this review criterion.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- G. The location and arrangement of signs, structures, parking and loading areas, material/waste storage, walks, lighting and related facilities shall be compatible with existing and future uses both within and adjoining the proposed development;

Staff Comment: Staff feels that the proposed development complies with this review criterion.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- H. The proposed development shall preserve natural features such as watercourses, trees and rock outcrops, to the degree possible, so that they can enhance the overall design of the PUD;

Staff Comment: Noting the areas designated as open space and the preservation of natural vegetation in those areas, particularly to the east, Staff feels that the proposed development complies with this review criterion.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- I. The proposed development is designed to take advantage of the existing land contours in order to provide satisfactory road gradients and suitable building lots and to facilitate the provision of proposed services;

Staff Comment: Staff feels that the proposed development complies with this review criterion.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- J. The proposed development shall not create excessive additional requirements for public facilities and services at public cost;

Staff Comment: Staff feels that the proposed development complies with this review criterion.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- K. The proposed development shall not involve uses, activities, layout and building designs that are detrimental to the use of both the proposed facilities and/or nearby properties by reason of excessive traffic, noise or vibration, storm water flooding, air or water emissions, objectionable glare or lack of proper regard for privacy;

Staff Comment: Noting that the only proposed uses are residential in character or passive open space uses, Staff feels that the proposed development complies with this review criterion.

Mr. Hussong asked for clarification on review criterion K. Mr. Hammes replied that the review criteria apply to all PUD proposals, regardless of type. Mr. Hussong noted that a business use would create more stormwater issues than the proposed residential use. Mr. Hammes confirmed that the aggregate stormwater from the site must be maintained or improved by the new use, whatever that new use might be.

Mr. Hussong and Ms. Cox agreed with the staff comment. Mr. Plant disagreed. The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 2-1.

- L. The proposed development has buildings designed with sufficient architectural variety and exterior surface complexity but including elements which serve to visually unify the development;

Staff Comment: Given the variety of home designs and their thematic similarities, Staff feels that the proposed development complies with this review criterion.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- M. The proposed development has minimized the size of paved areas or provided adequate visual relief through the use of landscaped islands while providing adequate parking.

Staff Comment: As no standalone parking lots or vehicular use areas are proposed, Staff feels that this review criterion does not apply. Guest parking spaces provided along common areas meet the code's requirements for such parking spaces.

Mr. Hammes noted that the only additional parking proposed in this development would be street parking at the center of the development (near the cluster mailboxes), along the northwest cul-de-sac, and at the tot lot.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

Recommendation

Ms. Cox reported that Staff recommended Approval of the proposed Planned Unit Development for the Towns at Cassel Grove. Mr. Hussong made a motion to recommend approval. Mr. Plant seconded.

By a vote of 3-0, the Planning Commission recommended **Approval** of the proposed Planned Unit Development.

Ms. Cox reported that Staff recommended Approval of the proposed Preliminary Plan for the Towns at Cassel Grove. Mr. Hussong made a motion to recommend approval. Mr. Plant seconded.

By a vote of 3-0, the Planning Commission recommended **Approval** of the proposed Preliminary Plan.

Ms. Cox noted that the recommendations of the Commission would next be reviewed at the Council Study Session on Monday, July 21st, 2025.

Mr. Donathan stepped to the podium and began to speak. Ms. Cox stated that the public portion of the meeting had closed. Mr. Donathan handed his petition to the chair, and reported that the City would be hearing from his attorney.

New Business – PC 25-0009 – Rezoning – 3675 Wyse Road

Mr. Hammes introduced Case PC 25-0009. Richard Drake, of Drake Architecture, on behalf of R&R Takhar Oil Company, requests a change of zoning as previously established by the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Vandalia. The request involves three parcels totaling 5.219 acres +/-, located at 3675 Wyse Road in the City of Vandalia. As proposed, the subject properties would be rezoned from the O/IP - Office / Industrial Park district to the I – Industrial and HB – Highway Business districts.

Mr. Hammes explained that R&R Takhar Oil Company, a current Vandalia business, wished to consolidate its operations onto one property. They propose a new corporate office building, a fueling station with convenience retail, and a truck facility to maintain the company's fleet of fuel trucks.

Mr. Hammes added that the fueling station use would require Highway Business zoning, while the truck facility would require Industrial zoning.

Mr. Hammes described the surrounding zoning as a blend of I – Industrial and O/IP – Office / Industrial Park districts. The proposed Industrial zoning would fit well with the industrial parcels in the vicinity. Highway Business zoning is not present, but the location of the site near I-75 makes an HB zoning reasonable for this site.

Mr. Hussong asked about the volume of trucks stored at and serviced by the proposed truck facility. Mr. Hammes replied that the applicant was present and would be able to provide that information.

Mr. Hussong asked about access to the site. Mr. Hammes explained that there would be two curb cuts for the office parcel and one each for the truck facility and fueling station. An additional point of access may be established between the adjacent property and the fueling station, but that that arrangement would be negotiated between the two property owners.

Ms. Cox invited the applicant to the podium.

Mr. Richard Drake, of Drake Architecture, spoke on behalf of the applicant. In response to Mr. Hussong, Mr. Drake reported that Takhar Oil operates 50 vehicles servicing over 75 fueling stations. 8 to 10 trucks would be stored on this property at any one time.

Mr. Drake explained that the company needs additional office space to bring their entire operation together on one property. The fueling station would be a test store where they can showcase their operations and try new things.

Mr. Drake noted that he had lived in the area for years, and that he was surprised that this property had remained vacant for so long. This parcel is a natural fit for the proposed use, and a fueling station on this side of the highway would be successful.

Mr. Hussong asked if the flow of traffic at this site would be similar to the company's existing site. Mr. Drake confirmed that it would.

Ms. Cox asked if the area was already saturated with fuel stations. Mr. Drake replied that there were only three fueling stations in the vicinity, and none of them were on this side of the highway.

Hearing no further comments, Ms. Cox closed the public portion of the meeting.

Zoning Map Amendment Review Criteria

Recommendations and decisions on zoning map amendment applications shall be based on consideration of the following review criteria. Not all criteria may be applicable in each case, and each case shall be determined on its own facts.¹

- (1) The proposed amendment will further the purposes of this overall code;

Staff Comment: Staff feels that the proposed rezoning furthers the purposes of the code.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

¹ Vandalia Zoning Code, Section 1214.07(d) – Zoning Map Amendment Review Criteria

- (2) The proposed amendment and proposed uses are consistent with the City's adopted plans, goals and policies;

Staff Comment: Staff feels that the proposed rezoning is consistent with the City's goals and policies generally, and that it is not inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- (3) The proposed amendment is necessary or desirable because of changing conditions, new planning concepts, or other social or economic conditions;

Staff Comment: Staff feels that the proposed rezoning is necessary due to changing conditions, namely the long-planned expansion of commercial uses along the Benchwood Road corridor.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- (4) The public facilities such as transportation, utilities, and other required public services will be adequate to serve the proposed use;

Staff Comment: Staff feels that the proposed rezoning complies with this review criteria.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- (5) The proposed rezoning will not adversely affect the economic viability of existing developed and vacant land within the City;

Staff Comment: Staff feels that the proposed rezoning complies with this review criteria.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- (6) The proposed amendment is not likely to result in significant adverse impacts upon the natural environment, including air, water, noise, storm water management, wildlife, and vegetation, or such impacts will be substantially mitigated;

Staff Comment: Staff feels that the proposed rezoning complies with this review criteria.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- (7) The proposed amendment will not constitute an instance where special treatment is given to a particular property or property owner that would not be applicable to a similar property, under the same circumstances;

Staff Comment: Staff feels that the proposed zoning is justified on the merits, and does not constitute special treatment.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- (8) The proposed amendment would correct an error in the application of this Planning and Zoning Code as applied to the subject property.

Staff Comment: Staff feels that this criterion does not apply.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

Recommendation

Ms. Cox reported that Staff recommended Approval of the proposed rezoning from the O/IP – Office / Industrial Park district to the HB – Highway Business and I – Industrial districts, respectively. Mr. Plant made a motion to recommend approval. Mr. Hussong seconded.

By a vote of 3-0, the Planning Commission recommended **Approval** of the proposed rezoning.

Ms. Cox noted that the recommendations of the Commission would next be reviewed at the Council Study Session on Monday, July 21st, 2025.

New Business – PC 25-0010 – Conditional Use (Truck Facility) – 3675 Wyse Road

Mr. Hammes introduced Case PC 25-0010. Richard Drake, of Drake Architecture, on behalf of R&R Takhar Oil Company, requests Conditional Use approval for a Truck Facility in the I – Industrial district. The request involves two parcels totaling 1.814 acres +/-, located at 3675 Wyse Road in the City of Vandalia.

Mr. Hammes explained that the project involves a truck facility at the north end of the site. Truck facilities are conditional uses in the I – Industrial district. He noted that this particular truck facility would only service trucks owned by the company itself, and would not be open to the public as such.

Mr. Hammes added that there would be no amenities provided for truck drivers. The 9,000 square foot structure would be used for maintenance and repair of trucks.

Mr. Hammes pointed out that the applicant would need to improve Homestretch Road by widening the west side of the road to meet the requirements of the Thoroughfare Plan.

Mr. Hammes reported that Staff recommended three conditions. These were listed as follows:

1. No conditional use approval shall be effective for this site until the effective date of legislation approving the rezoning of this site to the I – Industrial district.
2. All parcels upon which the proposed conditional use shall be conducted must be consolidated before any building permit is issued for this site.
3. All required roadway improvements shall be completed to the standards of, and under the supervision of, the Director of Public Service.

Mr. Hammes explained that these conditions were not unusual for a facility of this type. Condition 1 requires that the site be rezoned to Industrial before the conditional use goes into effect. Condition 2 would require that the two parcels set aside for this use be combined. Condition 3 requires that all roadway improvements be installed according to the Director of Public Service's standards.

Mr. Richard Drake returned to the podium to speak on behalf of the applicant. He explained that the facility would have a small break room and restrooms for employees working on trucks, but will otherwise have no amenities for drivers.

Mr. Hammes pointed out that the plan included no provisions for large fuel tanks or equipment for loading fuel into the company's fuel tanker trucks. Mr. Drake confirmed that there would be no fuel products stored on-site. He added that any fuel trucks stored on-site would be stored empty.

Hearing no further questions, Ms. Cox closed the public portion of the meeting.

Ms. Cox noted that the current application is a much better use than previous proposals for this property.

Conditional Use Permit Criteria

Ms. Cox read the conditional use permit criteria into the record. The Planning Commission shall not recommend in favor of an application for a conditional use permit unless it finds the following:

- (1) The establishment, maintenance, or operation of the conditional use would not be detrimental to or endanger the public health, safety, morals or general welfare;

Staff Comment: Given that this facility would not be open to the public, Staff feels that the use would meet this criterion as proposed.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

Conditional Use Permit Criteria (Cont'd)

- (2) The conditional use will not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purposes already permitted, or will not substantially diminish and impair property value within the neighborhood;

Staff Comment: Staff feels that the conditional use would not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the vicinity, nor would property values be negatively impacted.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- (3) The establishment of the conditional use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding property for uses permitted in the district;

Staff Comment: The proposed conditional use does not appear likely to impede the development or improvement of any surrounding property.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- (4) Adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and other necessary facilities have been or are being provided;

Staff Comment: The proposal includes provisions for adequate utilities, drainage, roadway improvements, and other necessary facilities.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- (5) Adequate measures have been or will be taken to provide ingress and egress so designed to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets;

Staff Comment: The design of the site provides appropriate access to and from Homestretch Road. The proposed conditional use is not expected to significantly impact traffic conditions on either roadway.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

- (6) The conditional use will be located in a district where such use is permitted and that all requirements set forth in this code and applicable to such conditional use will be met.

Staff Comment: Staff feels the conditional use will be located in a district where such use is conditionally permitted, and all requirements set forth in the code applicable to this use have been or will be met.

The Planning Commission agreed with the staff comment by a vote of 3-0.

Recommendation

Ms. Cox reported that Staff recommended **approval** for the proposed conditional use of a Truck Facility in the I – Industrial district with the following conditions:

1. No conditional use approval shall be effective for this site until the effective date of legislation approving the rezoning of this site to the I – Industrial district.
2. All parcels upon which the proposed conditional use shall be conducted must be consolidated before any building permit is issued for this site.
3. All required roadway improvements shall be completed to the standards of, and under the supervision of, the Director of Public Service.

Mr. Plant made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed conditional use, with the conditions as laid out by Staff. Mr. Hussong seconded the motion.

By a vote of 3-0, the Planning Commission recommended **Approval** of the proposed conditional use permit with three conditions.

Ms. Cox noted that the recommendations of the Commission would next be reviewed at the Council Study Session on Monday, July 21st, 2025.

Communications

Mr. Hammes noted that the reorganizational meeting would be held at the first meeting with all five members present - including a new member who would fill the current vacancy. Mr. Hammes also wished Mr. Arnold a speedy recovery.

Mr. Hammes confirmed that the July 22nd meeting had been cancelled for lack of an agenda. He added that he expected to have at least one application for the meeting on August 12th.

Mr. Hammes reminded the Commission of the joint Planning Commission / BZA training scheduled for July 29.

Mr. Hammes (belatedly) welcomed Mr. Hussong to the Planning Commission, and thanked him for volunteering to serve.

Adjournment

Ms. Cox asked for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Hussong made the motion. Mr. Plant seconded the motion. The vote passed 3-0.

Mr. Atkins adjourned the meeting at 8:40 p.m.

Chair