CITY OF FAIRBORN
PLANNING BOARD FORMAL SESSION
June 10, 2025 - 4:00 p.m.

Chair McCauley called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

BOARD MEMBERS	**Present**	**Absent**
Marilyn McCauley, Chair	☒	☐
Pam Gayheart, Vice Chair	☒	☐
Amy Davenport, Board Member	☒	☐
Michael Cox, Board Member	☒	☐
Kevin Knepp, Board Member	☒	☐
Gary Siembab, Board Member	☒	☐
Tim Steininger, Board Member	☒	☐

Ms. McCauley led the Pledge of Allegiance.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Kathleen Riggs, City Planner, Manuel Jacobs, City Engineer, Marie Gay, Planning Board Secretary

CITIZENS PRESENT

Ryan Ryder, Christy Shope, Mike Shope, Sheryl Baker, Matt Adams, Dan Brown, Brent Cartwright, Lance Oakes, Alan Carney

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A motion was made by Ms. Gayheart, seconded by Dr. Siembab, and carried to approve the agenda for the June 10, 2025, Planning Board meeting.

Dr. Cox	Yes	Ms. McCauley	Yes
Ms. Davenport	Yes	Mr. Siembab	Yes
Ms. Gayheart	Yes	Mr. Steininger	Yes
Mr. Knepp	Yes		

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Mr. Steininger, seconded by Mr. Knepp, and carried to approve the minutes for May 13, 2025, Planning Board meeting.

Dr. Cox	Yes	Ms. McCauley	Yes
Ms. Davenport	Yes	Mr. Siembab	Yes
Ms. Gayheart	Yes	Mr. Steininger	Yes
Mr. Knepp	Yes		

OLD BUSINESS

CASE #2025-04

Request for approval of a Replat to split off approximately 1.09 acres from an existing 6.564-acre parcel creating two (2) new lots located at 550-700 Pierce Dr. (parcel # A02000100040002400) in a Community Commercial Zoning District.

Ms. Riggs stated Case 2025-04 will be tabled until August 12, 2025, Planning Board meeting.

A motion was made by Ms. Gayheart, seconded by Ms. Davenport and carried to table Case No. 2025-04 until the August Planning Board meeting.

Dr. Cox	Yes	Ms. McCauley	Yes
Ms. Davenport	Yes	Mr. Siembab	Yes
Ms. Gayheart	Yes	Mr. Steininger	Yes
Mr. Knepp	Yes		

NEW BUSINESS
CASE #2025-08

An application has been received by the Planning Board requesting approval for a Replat to split an existing lot with two (2) existing detached single family dwellings into two (2) lots, each with a detached single family dwelling, and shall be .1238 and .1278 acres in size located at 412 and 420 Xenia Dr. (City Lot 26) in a UER Urban Edge Residential Zoning District.

Owner: Ocean Snow Properties

Applicant: Ryan Ryder

Site Plan Professional: McDougal-Marsh
Land Surveyors
8529 Byers Rd.
Miamisburg, OH 45342

Ms. Riggs said this is a replat of 412-422 W. Xenia Drive; she reviewed the aerial and zoning maps with the Board and stated the overall site is approximately .2516 acres and has two existing structures, one is a duplex and the other split up into five apartments. She said the proposal is to split this lot in half with one lot being .1238 acres and the other lot being .1278 acres. She said this will provide the same side yard setback of 24.6 from the existing structures. Ms. Riggs stated the current owner acquired this land in the fall of 2024 and they would like to separate these two buildings and have them be associated with their own lot. She said each proposed lot has direct street access and each dwelling has separate utilities including water and sewer, while these proposed lots do not meet the lot standards or the required parking requirements for their existing uses, these lots will be similar in size to other lots in area for single family and multi-family uses.

Ms. Riggs said I did speak with a couple of the neighboring property owners and received an email as well; Two of the people are opposed to the lot split because of the on-street parking concerns and the lack of visibility associated with those concerns. She said there was also concern about the utilities associated with each building and lack of heating and air. She said our Water and Sewer Department has confirmed that each dwelling has separate water and sewer connections and according to the property owner he has added new roofs, new supports/stabilizers for the foundation at 422 Xenia Drive, overhauled the entire electric at 422 Xenia Drive, added additional water heaters and plumbing repairs, and has provided pest control.

Ms. Riggs said I would like to discuss the parking further as the existing site has no onsite parking, I have passed along the parking concerns to our Police Department and our internal Traffic Committee composed of our emergency services staff and the public works department who will review and determine if any improvements can be made to ensure safety in the area. She said I did receive a response from the Police Department who looked at records since the beginning of the year and they have received no parking complaints; Our code enforcement staff

have had no complaints since 2023. (Over the last 10 years most of the complaints were about tall grass and a couple for illegal parking)

Ms. Riggs stated that I have spoken to the owner about the possibility of adding parking on the site and he is open to the possibility; we both realize that any additional parking is limited because of the size and configuration of the site and additional parking may also infringe on lot coverage and we will have to look at the impact on stormwater runoff. She said while the site can't accommodate all of the required parking needed for the number of units associated with this site, any relief would be appreciated. She said secondly, we also want to promote practices that legalize existing residential units on individual parcels; The proposed lot layout is like adjacent structures and lot design. She stated that Staff have determined the recommendation of approval shall not adversely affect the spirit and intent of the Zoning Code and shall not result in special privileges for the applicant or hardships to neighboring property since there will be no changes to the existing property.

Ms. Riggs stated that Staff recommends approval of the replat with two conditions:

1. Any parking added to the site shall be approved by the City Planner.

2. Two (2) durable Mylar copies of the approved document shall be submitted to the City for signatures: both copies shall be signed and subsequently stamped as recorded within nine (9) months of City Council approval and one (1) Mylar copy shall be returned to the City of Fairborn's Engineering Division.

Ms. Riggs asked if there were any questions.

Board Questions

Dr. Cox asked if there is access to an alley that is behind the lot and wasn't sure if the lot goes all the way to the alley. Ms. Riggs stated that the lot does not go all the way to the alley because there is a separate parcel between this lot and the alley.

Ms. McCauley asked if the heating and air conditioning situation had been addressed. Ms. Riggs stated according to the owner the issues with those dwellings have been addressed. Ms. McCauley said regarding parking it will not be changed whether the lots are split or not, it is what it is and has been for years. Ms. Riggs agreed.

Public Hearing

A motion was made and carried to open the Public Hearing at 4:26 pm.

Dr. Cox	Yes	Ms. McCauley	Yes
Ms. Davenport	Yes	Mr. Siembab	Yes
Ms. Gayheart	Yes	Mr. Steininger	Yes
Mr. Knepp	Yes		

Applicant

Ryan Ryder stated he is the owner of this property and shared with the Board his story and how he came to be the owner of this property as an investment. He said this property is a multi-unit with two separate buildings; we purchased the property last summer and closed in September. He stated after an inspection there were signs of neglect from the previous owner. He stated there was hardly any work done on the property and that is how I inherited it; and after that inspection report I knew there would be an upfront cost for this investment and that is what we handled right away, especially the safety issues. He said to beat the weather a new roof and

gutter replacement put on both buildings in October of 2024, he said there was a foundation issue where we put in new footer bases and slab jacked the building, this was expensive but important to make sure the building is safe for the residents. He said one of the complaints was lack of hot water; we found an old, outdated water heater and not working with the electrical system so in order to get the new water heaters we had to overhaul the electrical system, $17,000 of work on the 422 building to get it up to date. He said that it was quite an investment, but this was a good property and community that we could make these investments and keep it for a period of time. He stated so in the last six to eight months we have really taken time and effort into making sure these buildings are up to par. Mr. Ryder stated that when he looked into insurance for the property we were required to have separate policies for the two buildings; but it is one lot however you still need two separate policies. He said the utility building was for two separate properties and it didn't make sense that we are paying insurance and utilities for separate units that are all part of one lot which seemed to make more sense to have two separate lots not that we intend to expand or change the characteristics or nature of the building but it just seems to operate better and if there is ever a time in the future to convert the duplex back into a single-family home that would make more sense as well if this were a separate lot. Mr. Ryder said I found out about the parking issue as a result of this hearing and some of the comments; we are happy to work with traffic enforcement and work with the property manager and tenants about what we need to do to have safe parking. He said the lot coverage issues came up in our discussions and we will have to look into whether it is approved to see what we can do to add a small parking area on one of the properties depending on the outcome of this hearing. He said overall it has been an adventure so far but a good one, and this is a great community, and I am always happy to work with my property manager and maintenance on the different improvements being made. Mr. Ryder said I would like to have these two properties split and will not change the characteristics of the neighborhood at all but to essentially have two lots that conform with the community.

Board Questions

Ms. Gayheart stated just for clarification you would possibly look to put some sort of driveway in or some parking. Mr. Ryder used the aerial photo and described to the Board possible parking locations.

Mr. Siembab asked if there would be a fence to make a distinct separation. Mr. Ryder said we have not made those plans yet but maybe in the years ahead if one of the lots would be sold separately you may want to have that distinction a little more but at least if this is approved, we would have that distinction through the replat.

Dr. Cox said in the staff memo it mentioned that there may be a parking alternative, and you mentioned you were open to, but it seems like there really isn't an alternative that will magically make the parking fit in with the rules as they are written. He said this one building was built in the 1800's before there were cars and lots were laid out. Dr. Cox said in the downtown there are other small sized lots and to your knowledge have there been accidents because of parking congestion; there was one person that indicated they were afraid to back out. Mr. Ryder stated I believe that person is here to talk, and they can explain better; I do know from talking to my property manager that they do occasionally have to tell them to move their cars away from the corner but that's all I know of. Dr. Cox said this is just about splitting the lots which is not going to affect parking in any case.

Proponents

Brent Cartwright stated I don't really care about the lot split, but I know that 412 doesn't have water and sewer going to the property; so, if you give these people a lot split and they sell the

lot the sewer and water is coming from 422 and that is not allowed. He said you can't have two separate lots, and the utilities attached to one another can't be common. He said the parking issue the letter said single family on each unit, there are five units in the brick building and 2 units in the other that is 7 units. He said there is no parking on Xenia Drive. There was a question from the Board whether this speaker is a proponent or opponent. Mr. Cartwright stated that I am not against anything he is trying to do, I am just pointing out the facts about these properties. He said I am neutral on the lot split if they take care of the utility problem. He said you can't share utilities and the problem with parking is the fire hydrant in front of 412 so if you give them the lot split you will have all those people parking in front of the hydrant, there is no alley behind it and when I pull out on Second Street to go across Xenia Drive you have no line of sight to the east, you have to nose out and people fly down there and somebody is going to get killed. He said the people that live there park almost to the corner and the police won't enforce the 30' rule and there is no yellow paint on the curb to keep people from parking too close to the intersection.

Opponents

Emily Jenkins said I live directly across the street from the two lots. She said I can't tell you how many times I have almost been hit. She said after talking to the residents I don't believe any of the units have their own shower, bathtub, sink or toilet in their apartment. She stated I know I was told they were given two space heaters last winter and as far as parking on Xenia Drive, I have a small car and cannot see over an SUV with a pickup truck behind so my life is danger just pulling out of my driveway and it doesn't do any good when you have days like the Air Force marathon when all the vehicles have to be off the street. She said where will these vehicles go, there was a car towed a few years ago because it had broken down.

Bob Nelms stated my only issue is the spot they had pointed out to be possible parking spot there is a one hundred- and fifty-year-old tree right in the middle of that and I would hate to see the tree go away.

Applicant Comments

Mr. Ryder said regarding the comments made this would not change the current parking situation and the tree was in my mind and the only way we could add parking is to add a narrow strip on the 412 lot because I do not want to lose the tree either. He said the enforcement of the parking we are willing to work with traffic enforcement; I went by today and there are yellow lines painted and there are no broken-down cars. He stated regarding the utilities I am billed separately for both units so there is separate water and the sewer for 422 runs into Second Street and 412 runs into Xenia, so we are not crossing over potential property lines. He said there are certainly bathrooms with sinks, toilets and showers in each unit.

Staff Comments

Ms. Riggs stated I did confirm with our Water and Sewer Department that there are separate utilities for each of those structures; they actually took a camera through the sewer line and saw those connections.

A motion was made by Mr. Steininger, seconded by Ms. Gayheart and carried to close the public hearing at 4:40 pm.

Dr. Cox	Yes	Ms. McCauley	Yes
Ms. Davenport	Yes	Mr. Siembab	Yes
Ms. Gayheart	Yes	Mr. Steininger	Yes
Mr. Knepp	Yes		

Board Action
A motion was made by Ms. Gayheart, seconded by Mr. Steininger, and carried to approve Case 2025-08 with two conditions.

Dr. Cox	Yes	Ms. McCauley	Yes
Ms. Davenport	Yes	Mr. Siembab	Yes
Ms. Gayheart	Yes	Mr. Steininger	Yes
Mr. Knepp	Yes		

CASE #2025-09
An application has been received by the Planning Board requesting approval for Final Planned Unit Development (PUD) Plan and Final Plat Approval – Hillside Meadows, Section Two up to 42 lots on 13 acres with the extension of Wildflower Road and the establishment of one (1) new street.

Owner/
Applicant: Lance Oakes
Oakes Tree Development
8534 Yankee Street
Dayton, OH 45458

Site Plan
Professional: Reinke Group
Steve Lisle
63 Rhoades Center

Ms. Riggs said this is a Final PUD for Section 2 of the Hillside Meadows development. She reviewed the aerial and zoning maps with the Board. Ms. Riggs said looking back briefly, the Zoning Change and Preliminary PUD Plan went into effect in October of 2022 under Ordinance 26-22 for a total of 135 homes on 40 acres built out in 3 phases; then in July of 2023 Resolution 17-23 went into effect for the Final Plat of Section one (1) with the creation of up to forty-nine (49) new City Lots on fourteen (14) acres. Ms. Riggs pointed out Section 2 on the aerial map and said Section 2 will consist of 42 lots on about 13 acres, 2 lots will be for open space and will contain 1 retention pond there will be two streets, Wildflower Road will be extended and then there will be the creation of Cliffside Drive. She stated that at this time the developer is still in communication with the owner of the land needed to connect Cliffside Drive, but no agreement has been reached at this time. She said the street network has been approved by our Engineering, Police and Fire departments. Ms. Riggs said most of the lots range in size of about 7500 square feet to 8125 square feet, there are a few lots in the cul-de-sac and corners that are larger between a quarter to a half-acre in size. She stated that Section 2 will meet the conditions approved in the Preliminary PUD Plan and placed on the overall development, which includes lot standards. She said these homes will meet the architectural design requirements associated with the Preliminary PUD approval which is 25% of the front covered with brick or stone that wraps along the sides at least two feet in depth. She said as many of you know we recently approved architectural design guidelines in our zoning code, but those will not apply to this development as this development will follow what was approved in their preliminary PUD plan three years ago.

Ms. Riggs stated the input I received included an email which is before you, from the nearby homeowner on Cliffside Dr. who is opposed to the development and has concerns about

existing working times for the construction; I received two phone calls, one with concerns as to why this section is not complying with the newly adopted Zoning Code's architectural standards that became effective on May 8, 2025; the other phone call has concerns about the existing landscape buffer between Hillside Meadows and Deercliff Estates.

Ms. Riggs stated we have made the developer aware to make sure the property owners along Wildflower Road on the western side of the site don't remove the trees and holly bushes that have been planted and they are required to keep their landscaping but fences can go in there and we did share that information but that was presented with the prior Section. She said this development was approved prior to our updated guidelines and Section 2 is following the requirements established in the Preliminary Plan; and lastly, we have received prior concerns about the work hours of this development, so we have established hours for construction in the following conditions.

Ms. Riggs stated that Staff does recommend approval of the Final Plan for Section 2 with three conditions:

1. Construction work hour operations should consider adjacent communities and residences' welfare. Infrastructure work involving heavy operating equipment should not begin or extend beyond the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m., on Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Saturday and 9:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Sunday except in case of weather delays or other unexpected circumstances, and then only with approval from the City Engineer.
2. Two (2) durable Mylar copies of the approved document shall be submitted to the City for signatures: both copies shall be signed and subsequently stamped as recorded within nine (9) months of City Council approval and one (1) Mylar copy shall be returned to the City of Fairborn's Engineering Division.
3. All remaining and unaffected provisions, restrictions, and requirements of Ordinance No. 26-22 shall remain in full force and effect.

Ms. Riggs asked if there were any questions.

Board Questions

Dr. Cox said I was unclear when you are pointing out sections one, two and three; so the section we are talking about is section two. Ms. Riggs stated that is correct and reviewed the aerial map with the Board. Dr. Cox said so Section 3 has not been purchased so that is why Cliffside cannot be extended but they are hoping to do. Ms. Riggs said all forty acres have been purchased as this development will be built in phases. Dr. Cox said then why can't Cliffside be extended; Ms. Riggs said the developer does not own this small portion of land to extend the street. Dr. Cox said the original Preliminary Plan was approved in 2022 and the reason it has taken three years is because they were working on Section 1 and Ms. Riggs agreed. Dr. Cox asked if there are open spaces outside of the retention area; Ms. Riggs stated there will be retention with some open space; Dr. Cox asked if this was the in the proportion that the City of Fairborn normally expects a percentage of open space in a development. Ms. Riggs said this is what was approved of in the Preliminary Plan; Dr. Cox said you didn't answer the question and Ms. Riggs responded that this is what was approved in the Preliminary Plan. Dr. Cox said is the open area generally within the current code, even though it was approved that way earlier, are the open space expectations currently within the code; Ms. Riggs said this is definitely not 50% open space and that is in our new PUD guidelines.

Public Hearing
A motion was made and carried to open the Public Hearing at 4:54 pm.

Dr. Cox	Yes	Ms. McCauley	Yes
Ms. Davenport	Yes	Mr. Siembab	Yes
Ms. Gayheart	Yes	Mr. Steininger	Yes
Mr. Knepp	Yes		

Applicant
Lance Oakes said the corner lot that was discussed as open space is actually a lot, he said there were 49 lots in phase one, with one open space for the basin at the front of the community and then in phase two there are 42 lots with one open space at the back so there are 41 lots to be built on. He said the development to a pleasant surprise to me, and the builder has done extremely well, we started selling in December and I believe we are down to two lots remaining in phase one. Mr. Oakes said because of that there is a lot of construction activity going on and we try to be good neighbors, I have spoken recently to the neighbors across the street as well as worked with the builders and they are sweeping the streets about 3 times a week and they will be sweeping the neighbors on the other side of the road so they are not inconvenienced with the construction. Mr. Oakes said I have talked to the building about the hours of operation and they are going to talk to the subcontractors and hopefully they are not working out there until 10:00 at night and not staring too early but that is hard for us to police so please let us know or shut them down and it this becomes and issue for the residents, I will start putting fines on them and that will hopefully get them to start taking notice and adhere to that. Mr. Oakes said the development is going really well, price points are higher than expected originally and just excited to keep moving forward.

Board Questions
Dr. Cox asked who the landscaper is and Mr. Oakes said the landscaper is Vanderwist; Dr. Cox asked if they would continue to use him and Mr. Oakes stated there is no additional landscaping in Section Two, but I do know there are four trees at the entrance that we are replacing with larger and nicer trees. Dr. Cox said there will be more grass in the retention pond and Mr. Oakes said that it is correct for the dry basin. Dr. Cox said if you use Boxwood there is a Boxwood moth that is destroying those for your future information.

Proponents
Mike Shope
- Concerned about the proposed fence damaging the existing pine trees, the length of his property.
- Concerned about continued trash blowing onto his property.
- Concerned about the hours of construction and working too early or late and making too much noise.

Christy Shope
- Concerned about damage to the existing pine trees or possible removal of trees.
- Concerned about continued trash blowing onto her property.

Cheryl Baker
- Concerned about continued trash and gravel/dirt that is on the main road and in the driveway.

Opponents

Matt Adams

- Concerned about the landscaping along Wildflower Road in Phase One and allowing a fence to be installed.
- Concerned about property value with the construction of fencing along Wildflower Road.

Al Carney

- Asked for the Board to deny Section Two due to the development not being completed within two years.
- Concerned about the PUD zoning code requirements not being followed.
- Concerned about the connection to Cliffside Drive and disrupting a quiet neighborhood.

Christine O'Connor

- Concerned about water pressure.

Applicant Comments

Mr. Oakes stated that I would like to make it clear that I have no intentions of connecting Cliffside Drive with my development; I do not own that ground and I cannot make a connection; if I am ever able to purchase the land however the landowner will not return my call, this cannot happen and I have no intentions of connecting Cliffside Drive. Mr. Oakes said for the treeline that were discussed on the new tree line I have no intention of putting in a fence; we are trying to save the trees, we are doing a little clearing and I do know that unfortunately at the front of the property we will have to get close to that property line because of the grade of the land but I will make sure I will not be impacting the trees on the neighboring property. He said the stakes you see today are the property line and clearing limits. He said we want to clear as little as possible. Mr. Oakes said the properties along Wildflower are allowed to put in a fence and it was a little misleading because one of the residents are parking a vehicle on a Wildflower property where a fence was going up. He said I will continue to work with those homeowners to make sure the trees and bushes remain. Mr. Oakes said there is a water tower right here so I would question the Engineering Department to figure out why there is low water pressure. Mr. Oakes said we are sweeping the streets three times a week and we are going to sweep the neighbors across the street so there are no issues. He said we have put up a fence to try and catch some of the trash and it has been windy.

Staff Comments

None

A motion was made by Ms. Davenport, seconded by Mr. Knepp and carried to close the public hearing at 5:27 pm.

Dr. Cox	Yes	Ms. McCauley	Yes
Ms. Davenport	Yes	Mr. Siembab	Yes
Ms. Gayheart	Yes	Mr. Steininger	Yes
Mr. Knepp	Yes		

Board Questions

Mr. Knepp said I am concerned about the legality of the PUD and the timeline of years and asked for that to be clarified.

Ms. Riggs stated I do not believe that is correct; I believe a Preliminary PUD plan approval is good for twelve months unless a Final PUD plan is approved; the Preliminary plan was approved in September and the Final PUD plan was approved in the summer 2023, nine months later so we are valid, once the construction starts additional phases need to approved

within two years for each final phase and so the Preliminary Plan is still valid and they are progressing at an appropriate pace.

Dr. Cox asked if the City Attorney was here to address that particular ordinance and Ms. Riggs stated he is not here.

Mr. Knepp asked if condition for approval can be added, I know when you see construction sites the stuff carried out onto the streets by trucks and they have things for water runoff and erosion control, I'm not sure what kind of mitigation can be put between the horse farm and the new construction, maybe some time of fence to catch blowing debris.

Ms. Gayheart said there should be something added to address the blowing debris.

Dr. Cox asked about the water pressure at this site. City Engineer Manuel Jacobs stated the waterline operations is more for the Water and Sewer Division and Travis Cooper would be the better person to answer that question in terms of the pressure and current health of the infrastructure in the area; we do have the water tower and I have not been made aware of pressure issues in the community and has not been brought to my attention but I can talk with Travis in the morning and investigate immediately.

Dr. Cox asked about the maximum lot size for PUD being over 25 acres and Ms. Riggs stated that I do not have my code book; we are here to approve Section Two, and this is not about the Preliminary Plan approval and what the PUD section in regards to the Preliminary Plan and I would just like to reinforce that.

Dr. Cox said I don't know if the garbage is coming from the dumpsters or if the construction workers sometimes do not take care of their garage. Have you talked to the construction company itself as to what their contribution is to the garbage problem.

Mr. Oakes stated it is primarily construction debris, and we can keep a construction fence which is up today and keep it up until that lot is ready to be seeded and then take it down. He said with the additional silt fencing that is there as well; we can do that and maintain that for the horse property moving forward.

Dr. Cox said given the lack of answers to the legal questions and for other reasons I was not here for the approval of the Preliminary Plan in 2022 so I do not have the history here so I am unable to support this case and would think it would be best to table the case until Legal can be here or I cannot vote on this today.

Mr. Oakes said I am a little taken back that people would be taking zoning law requests from Mr. Carney who is not an attorney and has no business zoning law so to table this would not be advisable because I do need to keep construction going and there is no reason for that.

Mc. McCauley said the comments came up about zoning codes and the fact that we had updated; are they required to meet the old zoning code since it started under the old plan or do the new codes come into play. Ms. Riggs said they are required to follow the approved Preliminary PUD plan and so that they set out all of the lot standard guidelines that they are asked to follow and that is what we are asked to review. She said that is what they are held accountable to; the new zoning code update became effective after their application was submitted.

Ms. Davenport asked for clarification in terms of the timeline. Ms. Riggs said in 2022 the development received approval for a zoning change and Preliminary PUD plan so all developments over 5 acres are changed to PUD, so the zoning change was necessary, and the PUD approval was put in place and then a year later the was the final development plan for Section One and now we are coming back with Section Two.

Board Action
A motion was made by Mr. Steininger, seconded by Mr. Siembab, and carried to approve Case 2025-09 with three conditions.

Dr. Cox	No	Ms. McCauley	Yes
Ms. Davenport	Yes	Mr. Siembab	Yes
Ms. Gayheart	Yes	Mr. Steininger	Yes
Mr. Knepp	Yes		

CASE #2025-10
Approval for the proposed Active Transportation Plan 2025, a guiding policy document that outlines strategies for improving Fairborn's infrastructure for walking, biking, and other non-motorized transportation options. The plan defines a comprehensive vision for a safe, accessible, and connected network that supports mobility, health, economic opportunity, and quality of life.

Applicant: Brad Kerry
City of Fairborn
Planning Specialist

Brad Kerry stated this is an overview of the Active Transportation Plan. He said this will provide plans to improve walking, cycling and other non-automotive transportation in the city and it focuses on connecting major spots in the city to each other including the downtown area, schools, parks, shopping areas and other areas of public interest. He said when we did our studies we had inputs from over two hundred citizens on this overwhelmingly positive and in support of this; we did have a few people that had concerns, and those concerns have been addressed. He said there have several iterations of bike plans or active transportation plans in the city through different departments and I gathered them together into one plan to make actionable.

Mr. Kerry reviewed the key highlights of the plan below:

- Implementation of Dutch-style protected intersections to improve bicycle and pedestrian safety at classified as Collector or greater.
- Creation of bicycle stop areas at intersections and trail connections to provide safer transitions and crossings.
- Development of a central bike hub featuring bike parking, repair stations, wayfinding, and connectivity to regional trails.
- Designation and development of mountain biking areas along major Active Transportation Routes in the City and in appropriate parkland settings to support recreational biking.

- Expansion of pedestrian infrastructure, including benches, shade pavilions, water refill stations, and trail lighting for comfort and accessibility.
- On- street parking along Kaufmann Ave for easy access to the Huffman Prairie Trail
- Increased support for the Buckeye and North Country Trails in Fairborn.

Mr. Kerry stated that Staff recommends approval of the Active Transportation Plan.

Board Questions

Mr. Knepp said I think it is great that over 200 residents responded to this and the community benefits are immense and I like the connectivity with the parks and trail systems. Mr. Knepp said I guess we will need to come up with funding, and some way-finding signage.

Mr. Kerry said we specifically named it the Active Transportation Plan because there are grants for that specific name and there are grants that do exist that we would explore.

Ms. Gayheart said this is incredible work that you have done and also the involvement of youth and family by using the schools to ask questions and conduct the survey and I think that it is a job very well done. Mr. Kerry thanked Ms. Gayheart for helping him utilize the schools for the study.

Dr. Cox said will part of the trail go by the bike park on Maple over the railroad tracks; is that going to be connected with it as one of the places that cyclists can get off and have an activity. Mr. Kerry said the trail will go past it and there are already features there.

Board Action

A motion was made by Dr. Cox, seconded by Mr. Knepp, and carried to approve Case 2025-10.

Dr. Cox	Yes	Ms. McCauley	Yes
Ms. Davenport	Yes	Mr. Siembab	Yes
Ms. Gayheart	Yes	Mr. Steininger	Yes
Mr. Knepp	Yes		

OTHER BUSINESS

None

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Ms. Gayheart, seconded by Mr. Siembab, and carried to adjourn the meeting.

Dr. Cox	Yes	Ms. McCauley	Yes
Ms. Davenport	Yes	Mr. Siembab	Yes
Ms. Gayheart	Yes	Mr. Steininger	Yes
Mr. Knepp	Yes		

The meeting was adjourned at 5:54 p.m.