

A regular session of the Troy Planning Commission was held in Council Chambers, City Hall on Wednesday, June 24, 2026, at 3:30 p.m. with Chairman James McGarry presiding. ATTENDING: Members – McGarry, Wolke, Titterington, Westmeyer and Emerick; Development Staff – Eidemiller and Burgei; Development Director Tim Davis; Director of Law Grant Kerber, Member of Troy City Council – Hickman; and citizens.

A motion was made by Mr. Westmeyer, seconded by Mr. Emerick, to approve the minutes of the June 10, 2026 regular meeting and the June 18, 2026 Workshop; motion approved by unanimous voice vote.

REVIEW OF DRAFT UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT CODE (UDC). Staff provided the following memo to discuss policy items as follows

- Principal Buildings (pg. 16). Add language in the draft UDC to ensure that agricultural buildings in the agricultural district associated with agricultural uses are considered principal structures and not accessory structures.
- Gateway Overlay District (pg. 32). This new chapter is intended to provide guidance to architects and designers when developing commercial property along major thoroughfares. Clarify language in the UDC by removing "and intersecting street" to ensure only properties that have frontage on main thoroughfares are included.
- Wireless Communication Facilities (pg. 59). Language being finalized by American Structurepoint to comply with federal law.
- Wind Energy System (pg. 73). The draft UDC does not allow wind facilities as an accessory use. Discuss whether the PC wishes to allow wind facilities in certain zoning districts.
- Beekeeping (pg. 75). Add "as determined by the DCA" to the end of the 1104(E)(6)(j).
- Solar Energy System Accessory (pg. 80). Remove the first sentence in 1104(E)(22)(a)(7) that reads "Roof-mounted solar energy systems shall be placed only on the roof of a conforming structure."
- Nursery Parking (pg. 96). The UDC states "one (1) space per six hundred and fifty (650) gross square feet; if there is no building then one space per employee on the largest shift". Clarify language to require one space per five hundred square feet of retail space and in the case of no retail space, require 10 parking spaces.
- Cross Access (pg. 104). Section 1105.04(G)(3) of the draft UDC allows two or more adjoining commercial properties to have cross access. Add language to cite traffic safety and traffic flow as criteria for cross access.
- Fences (pg. 118). Section 1105.04(1)(7) sets regulations regarding chain link fences. Add language to the first sentence to clarify that property owners cannot install a chain-link fence within any front yard setback.
- Sign Code (pg. 121). Section 1105.05 - Language being reviewed by American Structurepoint to review sign colors vs. copy right laws.
- Sign Code (pg. 147). Fix Table 1105.26, Temporary Signs, maximum duration from 30 days to 28 days in a calendar year which may be split into a maximum of four (4), *seven* (7) day increments.
- Sign Code (pg. 148). Alter Table 1105.27, Temporary Yard Signs, to allow 2 temporary yard signs on residential lots in the UCDistrict.
- Completeness Review of Applications (pg. 204). This section highlights the process for which the Development Code Administrator determines whether an application is complete or not.
- Staff Review following Completeness Review of Applications (Page 205). This section highlights the process by which the Development Code Administrator (DCA) proceeds with the various applications.
- Inactive Applications (pg. 206). Process and procedures for when an application goes dormant and voiding procedures.
- Planned Unit Developments (pg. 227). Outlines the process for Planned Unit Development. Staff would like to highlight the key changes between the existing Zoning Code and the Draft UDC below:
 1. The Final Development Plans have been merged into the same step as the Record Plan. This option creates a more efficient approval pathway for smaller projects while maintaining appropriate review standards. This takes the PUD Process from a total of three steps down to two steps to keep up with the development community.
 2. The draft UDC establishes clear procedures for major amendments, minor amendments, and administrative modifications to approved PUDs. The existing code contains amendment provisions; however, the new framework provides more detailed criteria and review procedures, improving consistency and predictability for future modifications.
 3. The draft UDC introduces a formal waiver procedure that allows the Planning Commission to approve deviations from specific PUD standards when the alternative design better achieves the intent of the development regulations or when practical difficulties exist. This provides a transparent mechanism for flexibility while maintaining oversight.
- 1109-06(4)(b)(6) (pg. 229). There was a typo in referring to the Planning Commission as the Planning Board.
- Demolition by Neglect (pg. 246). Section 1109k(l)(b), add the word "severe," prior to the word permanent.
- Non-Conformities (pg. 265). The UDC adds two classes of non-conformities to address non-conforming signs and site standards. The current Zoning Code does not address these classes.
- Non-Conformities (pg. 265). The UDC addresses the concern of discontinuance of a non-conformity by stating an abandoned structure that remains vacant for 180 days cannot be re-established. The current Zoning Code uses the term "voluntary discontinued" which means an act of one's own choice or will.
- Non-Conformities (pg. 265). The UDC eliminates the BZA's authority to allow for a substitution for a non-conforming use in a building. The current Zoning Code allows substitution by the BZA.
- Additional Terminology. (pg. 280). Added additional terminology to the Fourth Degree Misdemeanor classification to include "after proper notice."
- Definition (pg. 316). Site Development Plan renamed Subdivision Development Plan to be relocated in alphabetical order.
- Definition "Subdivision" (pg. 319). Update the definition to match the ORC.

Regarding "demolition by neglect" there was discussion about how the word "severe" would be interpreted and that the wording may be too vague. The Director of Law advised that courts would refer to the definition of *Webster's Dictionary*. It was stated that the Director of Law will work further on the definition.

Council Member Hickman commented that during a recent open meeting she held with ward members, concern was expressed regarding Data Centers and residents seemed to believe that tattoo parlors should be permitted in any commercial or business district.

Comments were made by Brad Boehringer (105 Crestwood), Dan Swank (702 Old Newton Pike), and Katie Wagner, primarily related to data centers and if they should be banned. Mr. Swank offered to provide information related to how Cuyahoga County handled this subject. Mr. Kerber advised that standards would need to be established for data centers; Mr. Titterington commented that data centers could be handled only under PD provisions; and it was commented that this is a subject the state legislature continues to review.

During the public comment session, Brad Boehringer referenced his understanding of a situation in Piqua, Ohio where public officials signed NDAs, much took place in secret, and there will be a negative environmental impact and extensive water use that would impact private wells and he asked about Troy officials signing NDAs. Both Mr. Kerber and Mr. Titterington stated that they have not been involved in signing NDAs for the City and did not know how that would be allowed. Mr. Titterington also advised that he is not aware of the situation described in Piqua, but that with technology, data centers use less water than may be thought and noted that golf courses use more water than data centers.

The Commission determined to set a public comment session on the draft UDC for July 22. Staff stated that the UDC draft on the City’s website will be updated prior to the next meeting for the Commission to view.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m. upon motion of Mr. Titterington, seconded by Mr. Westmeyer, followed by unanimous voice vote.

Respectfully submitted,

_____Chairman

_____Secretary