CITY OF FAIRBORN
PLANNING BOARD FORMAL SESSION
December 9, 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.

A motion was made by Mr. Knepp, seconded by Ms. Davenport, and carried to excuse Mrs. Gayheart.

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

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT
Kathleen Riggs, City Planner, Michael Gebhart, City Manager, Manuel Jacobs City Engineer, Lesley Adkins, Planning Board Secretary

CITIZENS PRESENT
Mick Oaks, Brandon Guyer, Bob Jurick, Janette Mayer

APPROVAL OF AGENDA
A motion was made and carried to approve the agenda for the December 9, 2025, Planning Board meeting.

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
A motion was made by Mr. Diembab, seconded by Dr. Cox, and carried to approve the work and formal session minutes for the November 12, 2025, Planning Board meeting.

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

OLD BUSINESS
None

NEW BUSINESS
CASE #2025-20

An application has been received by the Planning Board requesting approval for a Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD) Modification Plan and Final Planned Unit Development (PUD) Plan to split an existing city lot into two (2) lots equaling .9402 acres and 3.1601 acres and to split another city lot into two (2) lots equaling 2.4019 acres and 1.474 acres located at 216 -260 E. Dayton Yellow Springs Rd. (city lot 9909 & 9812) in a PUD Planned Unit Development Zoning District.

Applicant: Jacob Harris
Cobblestone Capital

Ms. Riggs said this is a proposed lot split to create 5 lots; Kevin Desch from McDougall Marsh Land Surveyors will be representing the applicant Cobblestone Capital. Ms. Riggs reviewed the site plan and surrounding zoning districts. She stated the owner would like to create 5 new lots for commercial development. She reviewed the Record Plan with the board which outlined the newly created lots in red. Ms. Riggs stated that just like in previous approvals, cross access easements will be required; the new lots will continue to share access with the other business' located on tis overall site. Ms. Riggs reviewed the Preliminary PUD standards with the board and stated that all the applicable standards for this site have been met. She said the owner of Donato's called to follow up on the access easement not yet recorded and Ms. Riggs stated this will be required prior to the approval of any building plans. She said as with proper approvals we will add a condition to ensure access remains across all the lot in this overall development.

Ms. Riggs stated that Staff recommends approval Alternative 2.

ALTERNATIVES:

1. Approve the proposed Preliminary and Final PUD plans as submitted by the Applicant based on the Board's ability to make the necessary determinations found in FCO Chapter 1123 & 1132, finding that they are consistent with the general criteria for approval.

2. Conditionally approve the proposed Preliminary and Final PUD plans as submitted by the Applicant based on the Board's ability to make the necessary determinations found in FCO Chapter 1123 & 1132, finding that, with the following conditions, they are consistent with the general criteria for approval:

   1) Access agreements between the newly created lot and adjacent lots shall be maintained and recorded with Greene County.

   2) Two (2) durable Mylar copies of the approved record plan must be submitted, signed, and recorded within nine (9) months, with one copy returned to the City Engineering Division.

3. Deny the proposed Preliminary and Final PUD plans as submitted by the Applicant based on the Board's ability to make the necessary determinations found in FCO Chapter 1123 & 1132, finding that they are inconsistent with the general criteria for approval.

Ms. Riggs asked if there were any questions.

Board Questions

Mr. Steininger questioned the bank located at the north end of the parcel and whether there was a property line; Ms. Riggs stated when the bank was operational it was a separate lot and there were access agreements with that lot and the adjacent parking, but that property line has been removed.

Mr. Knepp asked to see the current access to Beaver Valley Road in relation to the lots in red. Ms. Riggs reviewed the site plan and stated the easement access lane is directly south of the Dutch Bros. lot and the Donato's lot and will go directly to Beaver Valley Road. Mr. Knepp asked if the easement next to Donato's on Dayton-Yellow Springs is also shared or if it is located on Lot 9911. Ms. Riggs stated it is currently in Lot 9911; she clarified the easement access drives on Lots 9911 and 9912. Mr. Knepp said this is important because Lot 9913 would be blocked because I don't think we will allow access to Dayton Yellow Springs Road after that is closed so does the access extend down to Lot 9911? Ms. Riggs said there is an access drive to Dayton Yellow Springs Road on Lot 9913 that will remain with Lot 9913, the access drive for Lot 9912 will remain and the access drive on Beaver Valley Road will be associated with Lot 9911 there are also two access drives at southern portion of the large parcel associated with Storage Sense. Ms. Riggs stated that you are correct that the access agreements are very important and that is why we have required the easements to be recorded for this site development and we want to encourage more development and that is the goal of this lot split is to encourage development. Mr. Knepp said I believe Gator Brothers owned the land before with the former K-Mart; is this a valid use progressing from that? Ms. Riggs stated that in previous approvals for future uses of this site will have to be either Neighborhood Commercial or a residential use that we had previously approved and that may or may not come to fruition but that is possible. She said those uses that match the Suburban Residential and Medium Density Residential uses as well as Neighborhood Commercial as that is base commercial district in the Five Point area.

Mr. Steininger asked if parking for the storage unit is Lot 9911. Ms. Riggs said they have their own separate parking that is associated with that parcel with a drive aisle. Mr. Steininger said Lot 9914 does not have access. Ms. Riggs stated that it is correct and we have discussed that but because of this large commercial development we would like to support possible commercial development; there will be lots divided up and this is going to look a little different. She said that is why we have access agreements and we will answer those questions when the lots are developed.

Mr. Knepp said does the easement with Lot 9913 give access Dayton Yellow Springs Road and will that be defined to go all the way down to Lot 9914? Ms. Riggs said they are going to provide language that will give access to all those adjacent parcels, that is the goal to make sure everything is fluid to move back and forth.

Dr. Cox said the current access agreements for the Dutch Bros. has not been done yet and Ms. Riggs agreed. She said they have not been submitted to me, but they have also not yet submitted building plans, I think they are working on that language. Dr. Cox said the people that own the lots to be split are in communication with them over the access agreements; Ms. Riggs agreed and said they will have to record those agreements before Dutch Bros. can build.
Ms. McCauley asked if there is any way the people who own the lots can shut down those access areas, Ms. Riggs said no, the access must remain open in those agreements. She said

we want to make sure the existing businesses, and future businesses remain viable and we want to keep circulation moving.

Public Hearing
A motion was made by Mr. Knepp, seconded by Dr. Cox and carried to open the Public Hearing at 4:18 pm.

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

Applicant
Kevin Desch with McDougall Marsh Land Surveyors stated he is representing the buyer and said everything was covered and asked the board if they have any questions.

No questions from the board.

Proponents
None

Opponents
None

A motion was made by Mr. Steininger, seconded by Dr. Cox and carried to close the public hearing at 4:20 pm.

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

Board Action
A motion was made by Mr. Steininger, seconded by Mr. Knepp, and carried to approve Case 2025-20 with conditions.

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

CASE #2025-21
An application has been received by the Planning Board requesting approval for a Zoning Map Amendment from LI Light Industrial to PUD Planned Unit Development, a Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD) Plan and Final Planned Unit Development (PUD) Plan for the construction of 212 multi-family units on 15.804 acres located at 2285 Commerce Center Blvd. (parcels include # A02000200350000700, # A02000200350000800, & # A02000200350025200) in an LI Light Industrial Zoning District.

Applicant: Mick Oakes
PLK Communities

Ms. Riggs said this is a Zoning Map Amendment, Preliminary PUD Plan & final plat for a multi-family development on Commerce Center Blvd. She said Brandon Guyer of PLK Communities is here today. Ms. Riggs reviewed the site plan and surrounding zoning districts with the board which include Light Industrial, Planned Unit Development and Parkland. She said the overall site is composed of 3 parcels equaling a little over 15.8 acres; the site includes 14 residential buildings with 6 duplex cottages; there is also a maintenance building and a clubhouse. She said the 212 units on the site are composed of either 16 or 8 units per building. Ms. Riggs stated the will be 36 one-bedroom units with a minimum of 849 square feet, 112 two-bedroom units with a minimum of 1,025 square feet and 64 three-bedroom units with a minimum of 1,242 square feet; all of which meet the minimum size per unit. She said the amenities include a clubhouse with exercise room, meeting or event space, kitchenette and a leasing office. She said outdoor spaces include a pavilion, swimming pool, dog park, pickleball court and mail kiosk. She said there will be 427 parking spaces that include 375 parking spaces, 8 accessible spaces, 20 detached garage spaces and 24 duplex garages with driveway spaces.

Ms. Riggs said the site is unique as it sits directly next to 2 parks, The Valley View Reserve South and the Beerman Fen that is going to be combined with the James Amon Reserve and are located directly west of this site. She said there are 2 existing wetlands located on the site and the developer plans to connect directly to the Spotted Turtle Trail from this site. Ms. Riggs stated our parks are a great amenity in this city and with the wetlands located in these parks and the recent addition of extending the boardwalk through these parks, we want to make sure that any new development doesn't adversely affect these parks. She said there are currently 2 stormwater ponds proposed, but this may change as the developer works on their stormwater plan calculations. Ms. Riggs stated because of the delicate nature of these parks located west of this site the city's engineering staff will work with the developers as well as Beavercreek Wetlands and BW Greenway on the stormwater plan. She said the overall site has an extensive landscaping package and we are working with the applicant on finalizing the plan and have made recommendations to make sure all the plantings are native. She said there will be buffer plantings along the property lines and along Commerce Center Boulevard. Ms. Riggs said our fire department reviewed the plans and found the site is sufficient for the city's emergency services as long as the buildings include fire suppression and detection and there is no on-street parking. Ms. Riggs shared the elevations with the board and stated these buildings will include a stone veneer and Hardie Plank board and batten, shaker and lap siding and she reviewed the floor plans with the board.

Ms. Riggs reviewed the development standards and said I would like to point out, this development does not meet our comprehensive plan, but with the multi-family development that has increased over the years on Commerce Center Boulevard and the parkland development to the west, we can make the argument that this use is a better fit at this location than light industrial and is compatible with the surrounding land uses. She said overall, most of the applicable standards for this site have been met; the site includes appropriate buffering, access, utility connections and building design. She stated adding these multi-family residential units seems appropriate and compatible.

Ms. Riggs said the feedback we received includes a letter from Redwood Living, who is supportive of the growth but thinks the density is excessive; Bob Jurick from BW Greenway reached out with concerns about the impacts of stormwater from this development. She said I have spoken with our engineering staff, and the development team will have to meet the stormwater standards as well as the standards set by the conservation easement that exists on the neighboring parkland. She said lastly, I also heard from the Beavercreek Wetlands

Association who have had several meetings with the Applicant who in their opinion seems to be open to feedback and want to be a good neighbor. Ms. Riggs said we connected these organizations with the developer early in this process, because we knew that in order for this development to move forward, they would have to have their support, and I believe we have attained that.

Ms. Riggs said, based on the general criteria for review, the proposed development complies with the intent and purpose of the Planned Unit Development and use maintains compatibility with surrounding open space, residential, and commercial uses and provides adequate access and infrastructure.

Ms. Riggs said staff does recommend approval of the proposal with conditions below:

1. Landscaping & Lighting plans updated.
2. Traffic Impact Study recommendations incorporated into the site development
3. Sidewalk extended to the property lines along Commerce Center Blvd.
4. Building Plans include fire suppression and detection and no street parking.
5. Plat recorded with Greene County.

Ms. Riggs stated that Staff recommends approval Alternative 2 and asked if there are any questions.

ALTERNATIVES:

1. Approve the proposed Preliminary and Final PUD plans as submitted by the Applicant based on the Board's ability to make the necessary determinations found in FCO Chapter 1123 & 1132, finding that they are consistent with the general criteria for approval.

2. Conditionally approve the proposed Preliminary and Final PUD plans as submitted by the Applicant based on the Board's ability to make the necessary determinations found in FCO Chapter 1123 & 1132, finding that, with the following conditions, they are consistent with the general criteria for approval:

    1. The landscaping and lighting plans shall be updated in accordance with the draft zoning code amendments for lighting and native plantings and approved by the City Planner.
    2. The recommendations from the Traffic Impact Study shall be incorporated into the site development and associated roadways as approved by the City Engineer.
    3. The sidewalk shall be extended to the property lines along Commerce Center Blvd. and approved by the City Engineer.
    4. In accordance with the State Fire Code, the submitted building plans shall include full suppression and detection and no parking signs along the 2-way drive aisles as approved by the Fire Chief.
    5. Two (2) durable Mylar copies of the approved documents 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. Deny the proposed Preliminary and Final PUD plans as submitted by the Applicant based on the Board's ability to make the necessary determinations found in FCO Chapter 1123 & 1132, finding that they are inconsistent with the general criteria for approval.

Board Questions

Mr. Knepp said the traffic impact study is important for us to understand when we have a question of the density of the property, I can see some congestion at the intersection and I am curious when the study will be available and how do you vote when you don't know what the study says. Ms. Riggs stated we have received the study and haven't had the opportunity to review its recommended findings also there are some additional areas that need to be studied in conjunction with this traffic report and that is why we do want to look into that study more and based on my experience those recommendations that come from those traffic engineering firms that complete those studies, we as staff can move those recommendations forward; but we do want to make sure they look at the intersection of Commerce Center Boulevard and Dayton-Yellow Springs Road as well as Commerce Center Boulevard and Trebein Road, not just the impact of 212 units on Commerce Center in general but how does this impact those two adjacent intersections. She said we do not have that information at this time, but we feel when we do receive that we can implement those recommendations.

Mr. Steininger said there are unknowns here; I think this is a good development but needs more work. He said if I vote yes or not based on the development just facts presented to us. He said I have no issue if this is for the Preliminary approval because in the past we have split the two, you have a Preliminary and a Final; I think we could say yes to the Preliminary that this is good; he said the traffic study would be available and they could come back for the Final.

Dr. Cox said I am thinking the same thing; there are a number of issues like the retention ponds, they are not worked out yet and there are issues on how that will work right next to the wetlands. Ms. Riggs said the retention ponds will not be finalized with the final development plan; I am just letting you know because that is not a requirement of the final development plan. She said they will have a stormwater plan, but we do not require them to complete the entire analysis for the final development plan for the stormwater plan; that is extensive engineering and that is usually not a requirement with this approval process. Dr. Cox said this is an unusual case given the proximity to the wetlands, which makes this unusual and unique. He said I think it is important to have more details or some indication that it is recognized about the importance to preserve the wetlands and not risk damaging them. Dr. Cox said there are native plant suggestions and asked if that is being worked out between the city and the developer. Ms. Riggs said that is correct and that is why we added that condition to finalize the landscaping plan as approved by the City Planner because there are some details that still need to be worked out. Dr. Cox said in my opinion I would agree that I would like to have the decision on the final plan not occur at this time; the preliminary plan and change of zoning seem alright but I would feel we would not make a decision on the final at this time.

Ms. Davenport asked for clarity of the DUA abbreviation; Ms. Riggs stated that is dwelling units per acre. Ms. Riggs said in the Medium Density Residential zoning in our overall Land Use Plan and that specific zoning district which this is Planned Unit Development and anything over 5 acres goes to Planned Unti Development but the Land Use Plan does have some Medium Density Residential as far as a reference for the type of dwelling unit density and that ranges anywhere from 10 to 20 and so this fits within that range. She said you can see the Medium

Density Residential in and around the interstate interchange, this is the type of development we would be looking for and so it does fit in.

Mr. Knepp said in regard to the wetlands, how are the wetlands are defined and by who, are they federal or state and what is the actual boundary. City Engineer Manuel Jacobs stated these are designated and identified wetlands, so they have federal jurisdiction under the Army Corp of Engineers as a water of the United States of America. Mr. Knepp said how is the defined encroachment; they are touching each other without a boundary or border. Mr. Jacobs said as part of the final plans and the stormwater engineering design, we will be looking for that impact of proximity and not just what they have on the schedule but how it is going to be constructed as well; there is going to be additional considerations and restrictions that will be in place to make sure the wetlands are not impacted in any way. Dr. Cox asked if the wetlands are class one, two or three. Mr. Jacobs said he did not know. Mr. Knepp said they talked about working together to define the water amounts and the Beavercreek Wetlands and the BW- Greenway, they are volunteer organizations and some citizens donate to those organizations and I know they work hard to protect the wetlands but I hope the city is involved and not just letting these two organizations use their volunteer money to be looking at this issue. Mr. Jacobs said there is no point where we are delegating or absolving some of our responsibility in our review or approval; we just understand given the uniqueness of this development with having designated wetlands within the property and how they are being proposed to work around them; we felt it prudent to involve the adjacent organizations that manage and maintain and work with these wetlands as we have had wetlands in the past that wetlands have not in our opinion been properly addressed, we are taking steps to avoid those situations so in an instance of a development where we have wetlands involved we felt it necessary to make it clear to Planning Board and if this moves forward to City Council that there is a wetlands and there is additional consideration we are going have to take into account in order to maintain their integrity and avoid adverse impacts. Mr. Knepp said the trail that is proposed along the Beaver Creek to go from Fairborn to Beavercreek, where is that and how will that impact the boundary of this property? Jackie Mayer from Beavercreek said the fen and the wetland connect to each other; we have had several meetings with the developers over the boundary. She said my organization is not totally volunteer, I have a paid staff and we are 501C3. She said the Spotted Turtle Trail currently goes through Beerman Fen to Valley View and James Amon Reserve. Mr. Steininger asked where the boundaries are today. Mrs. Mayer said their property and our property are next to each other. Ms. Riggs reviewed the site plan and property lines with the board and pointed out the property lines. Mr. Steininger asked if there was any desire to bring trails down to this area. Ms. Riggs said there is a trail connection proposed with this site development; they will connect to the Spotted Turtle Trail. Mr. Steininger asked if any of the property has been designated as a wetland. Ms. Riggs showed on the site plan the designated wetlands on the property; she said the wetlands extend on this existing site as with the adjacent park.

Public Hearing

A motion was made by Mr. Steininger, seconded by Mr. Knepp and carried to open the Public Hearing at 4:58 pm.

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

Applicant
Mick Oaks representing PLK Communities addressed the comments from the board and stated my understanding with the traffic impact study after talking with our traffic engineer at length is, there have been multiple months of dialog with the city on the traffic counts and other needed requirements; the counts and density is not a concern at all on our traffic impact study. He said it is just a few of the entrances that there were recommendations on Commerce Center to line up with Redwood entrances across the street. He stated in terms of density and overloading Commerce Center, that has not been a concern that I have heard to date; we are willing to work with all those comments but that has not been a concern.

Mr. Oaks said with the wetlands we have done full jurisdictional wetland delineation report; that is what identified these two wetlands that we have on our property and a portion of that spill over into our neighboring property. He said we do not anticipate impacting any of our wetlands on our site at all; we do not want to touch those; it is another process of permitting work that we are steering clear of completely. He said that is how we laid out our entire site plan to get to this point.

Mr. Oaks said the comment regarding the storm water plans; that is one hundred thousand dollars' worth of work and that is why we are here today; this is not an effort to push through an approval process but what a Preliminary and a Final PUD approval allows us to do, is close on a bank loan, closing on that bank loan then allows us to spend those dollars on finalizing the storm water plan and all the other requirements needed to go above and beyond. He said to lay out all those additional dollars from what we spent on the wetland delineation report which was around fifty to sixty thousand dollars upfront, so we want to continue this work and be good partners as it has been stated we have met with multiple adjacent neighbors, the Beavercreek Wetlands Association, the City Parks and Recreation, we want to make sure this is done right and we build to own and want to the community to thrive. He said we are now implementing ourselves into the communities that we are developing and want to make sure this is done accurately.

Mr. Oaks said the landscaping plan; we do not see any issues from the comments we received; we have a standard group of species, and we will definitely try to make them all native but sometimes it depends on what the nurseries have in stock. He said we run into that quite a bit of what is available to us, but we do not see any issues with those comments we received.

Mr. Oaks said he would definitely continue to ask for a map amendment, a preliminary and final approval because this will allow us to continue moving forward with our process; we anticipate with full approval we can complete the process over the next two to three months and we how to start site work in the early first quarter of 2026. Mr. Oaks reviewed with the board PLK Communities background.

Brandon Guyer with PLK Communities stated the traffic impact study showed no impact to Commerce Center Boulevard in terms of density, the only recommendation that the impact study suggested was to move the entry that was a little too close to the Redwood development, so they recommended moving the entrance to the north and that was to allow for a left hand turn lane to come into the development and then likewise turning left into the Redwood community. He said it was suggested for better queuing distance; the other entry could remain the same. He stated in the pool area we have a pavilion and the pool deck is synthetic grass material so it looks great and the residents prefer that to a concrete deck. Mr. Guyer reviewed the site plan for storm water and stated the blue area is the wetland and pointed out the

proposed detention basin and we are proposing the capacity of this entire wetland could be incorporated so we might not have to add this basin and tie into utilities on the south portion of the site; that was from a comment from the Wetland Association. Dr. Cox asked for clarification and Mr. Guyer reviewed the stie plan.

Mr. Oaks reviewed the floor plans and amenities with the board and stated we are excited to provide this product in Fairborn. He asked the board if there were any questions.

Board Questions

Dr. Cox said on the impact study you mentioned that really would not be impacting Commerce Center itself, the city had mentioned the impact it might have at Trebein or Dayton-Yellow Springs Road, do you know what the impact study says about them? Mr. Oaks said those two specific intersections were not included in our MOU outline; our MOU just includes Commerce Center Boulevard as Mr. Guyer said earlier the only recommendations we are discussing at this point would be the entrance suggestions. Dr. Cox said I thought you said there was an impact study that addressed those two intersections as well. Ms. Riggs said we have received the impact study, but we have not had time to review it, but it has been submitted. Dr. Cox asked if you could answer the question. Mr. Oaks asked if this was the question about Trebein and Dayton Yellow Springs Road; we did not see any impact on any of the surrounding intersections. Mr. Guyer said the impact study says that the development is going to generate about 60 to 200 trips per hour and based on the code that does not require us to go out and study the intersections at Trebein or Dayton-Yellow Springs Road, we just had to focus on Commerce Center Boulevard and our development proper. He said we had to do a Traffic Impact Study, and we did that but it also defines what the extent of that study must be, and those intersections are outside that extent.

Dr. Cox asked if the wetland delineation was done by the Army Corp of Engineers. Mr. Oaks said the wetland delineation was done by our Civil Engineer CEC, they came out and identified the limits of those wetlands with their wetland delineation team and that was confirmed with the Corp of Engineers. Dr. Cox said the previous development that contained a wetland that you made into a retention pond, I think of wetlands as having natives in there, now it looks like a retention pond and a pool of water, does it still keep the characteristics when you make into a retention pond. Mr. Oaks stated we are not able to touch them as they are protected, a discussion of a retention pond would still not be able to disturb the limits of those wetlands so absolutely they would keep the characteristics of what is there today. Dr. Cox said but to make them extended and make the water from the wetlands flow into the retention pond in another area that is outside its boundaries, it some way that is changing the wetland to make it bigger. Mr. Oaks said in the past when we have had these situations there is a certain amount that we can come close to but if we are enhancing what is already there that will be a discussion. Dr. Cox asked if you had thought about making buffers to those wetlands and having more of a buffer instead of the road right up against them and other parts of the facilities that are close to them; it seems like you could do some nice ten-foot buffers, you could rearrange things, remove the pickleball court. Mr. Oaks said I do hear the concern and reviewed the setback distance with the board; we view the pickleball court as an amenity but if that is something to remove we could look at that but ultimately we want to make sure we are doing this right and we are in compliance with what is required; in order to take that next step we need some assurances in place so we can continue to spend those dollars. Dr. Cox said I am in favor of doing a nice property like this as residential instead of industrial and done in the right way and it does seem that you are flexible that it would be a good compliment to the properties that it adjoins.

Mr. Steininger excused himself from the meeting to attend a special Fairborn School Board meeting.

Mr. Knepp said on the site plan the blue land is wetland and they are not ponds; Mr. Oaks said that is correct. Mr. Knepp said we may be misconstrued that there is a pond there already and it is just soft ground. Mr. Oaks said when we walked the property a few weeks ago there was no standing water, it was not soft ground, just what is identified as a wetland.

Proponents
Bob Jurick representing BW-Greenway said we are not necessarily a proponent, but we do not object; we have concerns. He shared the history of the BW-Greenway with the board, the requirements to maintain their status and easement clauses with the board. He said one concern is pollutants, salt, and oil from the parking areas, I would like to know where they will go and with the buffer area to the north, it is very important to know what will be there and it is compatible with the plans. He said another concern is the waterway there and we don't want a bridge over the waterway and we also have concerns about litter. He said our recommendation would be to encourage the people to use the park a lot and not try to cross over to Valleyview south and over the waterway.

Opponents
None

A motion was made by Mr. Siembab, seconded by Mr. Knepp and carried to close the public hearing at 5:31 pm.

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

Board Action
A motion was made by Mr. Knepp, seconded by Ms. Davenport, and carried to approve Case 2025-21 with conditions.

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

OTHER BUSINESS
Ms. Riggs thanked Ms. Marilyn McCauley for serving on the Planning Board and for serving as the Chair.

ADJOURNMENT
A motion was made by Dr. Cox, seconded by Ms. Davenport, and carried to adjourn the meeting.

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

The meeting was adjourned at 5:35 p.m.