

A regular meeting of the Troy Planning Commission was held in Council Chambers, City Hall on Wednesday, August 13, 2025, at 3:30 p.m. with Chairman James McGarry presiding. ATTENDING: Members – Westmeyer, McGarry, Wolke, and Ehrlich; Development Staff – Eidemiller, Bruner, and Burgei; Development Director Davis.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Upon motion of Mrs. Ehrlich, seconded by Mr. Westmeyer, the minutes of the July 23, 2025, meeting were approved by unanimous voice vote.

HISTORIC DISTRICT APPLICATION, CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS, 12 W. MAIN STREET, FOR WINDOW REPLACEMENTS: OWNER-APPLICANT – ROB & HEATHER DAVEY. STAFF REPORT: Staff reported: property is zoned B-3 Central Business District; the Ohio Historic Inventory (OHI) form describes this property as store fronts one half renovated, both iron pillars and cornice are still there, three bays each side recessed each set paladian form with shaped incised lintels and brackets—rosettes, heavy bracketed and decorated stone cornice; applicant proposes replacement of existing windows with new storefront-style windows with aluminum framing, these windows are not operational, the color of the replacement will remain the same as the current ones (UC109856 Permafluor Sandstone).

STAFF ANALYSIS (Windows):
Staff analysis can be found following each *bold* Design Manual guideline below:

Section 2.8 A. The position, number, and arrangement of original windows in a building should be preserved. **The replacement windows will have the same position, number and arrangement of the existing windows. The proposal meets this guideline.**

Section 2.8 B. If original windows are extensively deteriorated, only the deteriorated windows should be replaced. Avoid removing any that are still repairable. **The current windows are not original. The proposal meets this guideline.**

Section 2.8 C. Avoid enlarging or downsizing window openings to accommodate stock replacement window sizes. **The window openings will remain the same size. The proposal meets this guideline.**

Section 2.8 D. Replacement windows should match the appearance of the historic originals in number of panes, dimensions of sash members, and profile of sash members and muntins. Windows should simulate the operating characteristics of the originals. The same material as the original windows, usually wood, should be used. **The replacement windows will be aluminum storefront windows. Based on the information provided, staff is unable to verify the meeting rail/sash members dimensions. The proposal does not meet this guideline.**

STAFF RECOMMENDATION (Windows):
Staff recommends tabling the request due to the need for further information on the meeting rail profile and information related to the operational characteristics of the windows.”

DISCUSSION.

-Heather Davey, applicant, commented that she was unclear as to what additional information staff needs as she has responded to staff requests. She stated that the existing windows were installed at least 20 years ago and all were operational upon installation; over those years, some windows do not shut or some drop down from the top; it should be remembered that these are already replacement windows; and while this is now considered one building, it was once seven buildings that would have had some individual appearance and the original windows may not have been consistent; and the replacements are needed to address maintenance from water damage into the building.

-Staff indicated that the standards require making sure the meeting sash will provide a layer of character to the building; staff further commented that the windows on the Square side should have consistent windows; and efforts were made to reach the contractor for information as to the dimensions of the existing profile. To address Ms. Davey, staff commented that the applicant can provide a profile for each window using a tape measure; that pictures are needed of each window with indication of which are operational, and which are not, and information needs to be provided regarding what it would take to make each window operational and the timing for any work. Staff stated they can work with Ms. Davey, but the information is required.

ACTION OF THE COMMISSION:

A motion was made by Mr. Wolke, seconded by Mrs. Ehrlich, to table the Historic District Application for window replacements at 12 W. Main Street so that the applicant can provide the information requested by staff.

MOTION ADOPTED, UNANIMOUS ROLL CALL VOTE

PRELIMINARY PLAN, SHIVSAGAR RESIDENTS SUBDIVISION, LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF S. STANFIELD ROAD, NORTH OF COMMERCE CENTER BLVD.; OWNER – SHIV RENTALS LTD., BHAVESH PATEL, 2256 GIRARD LANE E.; APPLICANT – CHOICE ONE ENGINEERING FOR THE OWNER. Staff reported: the subdivision is located along S. Stanfield Road (Parcel ID: D08-059520); the land is currently undeveloped and is located on the west side of S. Stanfield Road north of Commerce Center Boulevard; the property is zoned OR-1, Office-Residential District; and staff further reported:

“PROPOSAL:

The submitted preliminary plan is the first step of the approval process. Should the proposed subdivision move forward, a Final Plat will follow to create the lots and to dedicate the streets and public utilities. Detailed engineering drawings will be required to be submitted for review and approval by the Development and Engineering staff. The Final Plat will be reviewed by Planning Commission who will make a recommendation to City Council. Council ultimately will have final approval of the Record plan.

Uses & Layout: The proposed subdivision encompasses three (3) acres and includes six (6) buildable lots that range from .367 acres to 0.552. Each lot will have a four (4) unit building that ranges from 5,048 Square Feet to 5,673 Square Feet. The OR-1 District requires a minimum lot area of 3,000 Square Feet per dwelling unit of which is met by this Preliminary Plan. Each unit will provide two (2) parking spaces as required by Zoning Code 1154.04 (b).

Roadways: Access to this development will be provided one cul-de-sac named Sia Court. Access management has been required by City Staff to align the drive with the adjacent fueling station at 151 S. Stanfield Road. Additional safety measures have been evaluated for the intersection of S. Stanfield Rd and Commerce Center Boulevard. The City Engineer and Assistant Fire Chief have reviewed the street layout and have indicated they have no issues with the proposal.

Utilities: This development will be served by city water and sewer lines. The plan seeks to mitigate storm water control by utilizing a retention area located in the north and south portion of the development. Maintenance of storm water control facilities will be the responsibility of the Homeowners Association.

Parkland: The developer is not proposing to provide any parkland within the subdivision and requesting to pay fees-in-lieu of parkland instead of providing the required three (3) percent as required by the Subdivision Regulations. Staff is in support of fees-in-lieu of as the park service areas map covers this development. On August 12, 2025, the Board of Park Commissioners approved fees-in-lieu of dedicated parkland for this Subdivision.

Landscape Buffer: A fifteen (15) ft landscape buffer is provided on the west side of the development as required by Zoning Code 1143.11 (e) (1). This will provide a variety of screening elements that include seven (7) green arborvitaes, three (3) Taylor Junipers, three (3) Dogwoods, and five (5) Viburnum’s.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that Planning Commission accept the proposed preliminary plan as it is in accordance with the Zoning Code, Subdivision Regulations, and other engineering standards.”

ACTION OF THE COMMISSION:

A motion was made by Mr. Wolke, seconded by Mr. Westmeyer, to approve the Preliminary Plan for the Shivsagar Residents Subdivision as submitted and based on the findings of staff that accept the proposed preliminary plan as it is in accordance with the Zoning Code, Subdivision Regulations, and other engineering standards.

MOTION ADOPTED, UNANIMOUS ROLL CALL VOTE

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:46 p.m., upon motion of Mr. Westmeyer, seconded by Mrs. Ehrlich, and approved by unanimous voice vote.

Respectfully submitted,

_____Chairman

_____Secretary

