

**ANDERSON TOWNSHIP ZONING COMMISSION
FEBRUARY 23, 2026**

The Anderson Township Zoning Commission held a regular meeting, duly called, on February 23, 2026, at 5:30 P.M. Present were the following members:

Jonathan Gothard, Chair, Susan Ward, Acting Vice Chair, Anne McBride, Brian Elliff, Jason Brewer

Also, present when the meeting was called to order were Paul Drury, Director of Planning and Zoning, Sarah Donovan, Assistant Director of Planning and Zoning, and Logan Vaughn, UC Co-op. A list of citizens in attendance is attached.

Mr. Gothard welcomed everyone and reminded all to sign in at the front of the doorway.

Approval of Agenda

Ms. McBride moved, Ms. Ward seconded, to approve the agenda for tonight's meeting with switching items 6 and 7.

A unanimous vote was taken

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Elliff moved, Ms. Ward seconded to approve the minutes from the **October 27, 2025, Zoning Commission meeting.**

3 Yeas, 2 Abstain- Mr. Brewer and Ms. McBride

Ms. McBride moved, Ms. Ward seconded to approve the minutes from the **December 15, 2025, Zoning Commission hearing.**

3 Yeas, 2 Abstain- Mr. Elliff and Mr. Gothard

Mr. Gothard swore in all those who wish to testify for the following quasi-judicial hearing.

CASE 1-2025 PUD MAJOR ADJUSTMENT

Mr. Drury stated that this is a continuation of a quasi-judicial hearing for Case 1-2025 PUD and read the staff report for an application filed by Chad Mayes, P.E. of Kimley Horn, on behalf of AREC 6 LLC, property owner, located at 8210 Beechmont Ave (Book 500, Page 41, Parcel 199), zoned "E-PUD" Retail Planned Unit Development.

Mr. Drury stated that the applicant is requesting to remove the condition that the 20' x 40' canopy be constructed of a standing seam metal, not fabric, placed in Resolution 2025-0623-01.

Mr. Drury stated that the Zoning Commission is reviewing the application because the ISR on the site was increased and the previous impervious surface ratio was greater than 60%, which triggers the PUD overlay and the standards found in Article 4.1 of the Zoning Resolution. Any adjustment to the PUD Plan within the criteria of Article 4.1 but not authorized by Article 4.1, shall be considered a major adjustment.

Mr. Drury stated the tract is 2.155 acres, with approximately 200' of frontage on Beechmont Avenue, the topography is relatively flat, and the existing use is U-Haul.

Mr. Drury stated that the applicant is requesting to remove condition #6 which states "That the canopy be constructed of a standing seam metal, not fabric" placed in Resolution 2025-0623-01. The applicant is requesting to install a fabric canopy, size 20' x 40', to be located in the front yard area, detached from the main building. The applicant has also submitted revised plans incorporating the other conditions.

Mr. Drury stated that the building on the property was constructed in 1970 and according to the Hamilton County Auditor website was purchased by U-Haul in 1984, and the current owner in 2006.

Mr. Drury stated that the applicant expanded the parking area by approximately 18'-28' to the east and 8' to the north in September 2024. The expansion occurred in conjunction with a parking lot repair. This increased the ISR of the property from 80% to 84%. Pavement was also added into the 10' required setback adjacent to the residential properties to the north, however, has since been removed back to within the required 10' setback.

Mr. Drury stated that an application for the parking expansion was submitted for the May 2025 Zoning Commission meeting, however, it was continued at the applicant's request to include a 20'x40' steel canopy with a fabric top, to be attached to the front of the building. The canopy was proposed over an existing drop-off area for trucks and equipment.

Mr. Drury stated that The Zoning Commission approved the PUD on 6/23/2025, with the following conditions:

1. Additional landscaping shall be installed to fill in the gaps along the new parking area to the north to provide a visual screening to the residential properties with 6'-8' arborvitae, while leaving a gap for the neighbor's gate to the north.
2. That an easement/right of entry be provided to the Township for the construction of a future sidewalk along Beechmont Avenue, per the recommendations of the Anderson Trails Plan adopted September 7, 2023.
3. That a revised site plan be submitted to include the parking expansion and canopy on

the same plan.

4. That the existing two dumpsters be enclosed and meet the Zoning Resolution requirements.
5. That no equipment, including trailers, be located within the 10' rear yard setback requirement.
6. That the canopy be constructed of a standing seam metal, not fabric.

Mr. Drury stated that the request to remove condition #6 should be evaluated in light of adopted plans for this area, such as the Anderson Plan, Beechmont Plan, and the Anderson Township Design Guidelines.

Anderson Plan

The proposal is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Anderson Plan and its recommendations for enhancing economic activities. The Future Land Use classification identifies the site for General Mixed Use, which is defined as "Community and regional oriented businesses, offices, and services that are located primarily along major thoroughfares. These uses may be located in individual-user buildings, multi-tenant buildings, or mixed-use buildings. Buildings are encouraged to be located close to the road with the majority of parking located to the side and rear of buildings. Residential uses may be located in mixed-use buildings but should only be located on the second floors or higher or behind nonresidential buildings." **The proposed use meets this description.**

Mr. Drury stated that the application is consistent with the following Goals of the Anderson Plan:

Economic Vitality: The Township should attract a variety of businesses to meet changing demographics and market demands. With a focus on an expanded tax base with an increasing amount of land developed for a mixture of non-residential uses, this will attract new businesses and promote and retain existing businesses.

Land Use and Development: Anderson Township will be a well-planned community with a mixture of parks, recreational uses, residential neighborhoods, commercial centers and an industrial base balanced with agricultural uses.

Beechmont Plan

U-Haul is located in Neighborhood Five which recommends the following (p. 60):

- Facades that identify individual tenant spaces
- Substantial, quality building materials

Design Guidelines

The following elements of the Anderson Design Guidelines are recommended (p. 33):

AWNINGS & CANOPIES

OBJECTIVES: When properly installed and maintained, awnings and canopies can enhance the appearance and function of a building by providing shade, shelter, shadow patterns, and visual interest. Where awnings are used, they should complement the design, materials, and color of the building.

DESIGN GUIDELINES

- Location. Where awnings are used, both fixed or retractable, they should be an integral element of the architecture. Awnings should be located directly over windows or doors to provide protection from the elements, and maintained in working condition.
- Materials. Awnings and canopies should not be made of highly reflective materials. Their colors should complement the facade of the building.
- Design Elements. Graphics used on awnings for identification or advertising should be designed as an integral part of the signage for the property, and be coordinated with other sign elements in terms of typeface, color, and spacing.

Mr. Drury stated that if approved, staff recommends the following conditions from the previous resolution remain:

1. Additional landscaping shall be installed to fill in the gaps along the new parking area to the north to provide a visual screening to the residential properties with 6'-8' arborvitae, while leaving a gap for the neighbor's gate to the north.
2. That an easement/right of entry be provided to the Township for the construction of a future sidewalk along Beechmont Avenue, per the recommendations of the Anderson Trails Plan adopted September 7, 2023.
3. That a revised site plan be submitted to include the parking expansion and canopy on the same plan.
4. That the existing two dumpsters be enclosed and meet the Zoning Resolution requirements.
5. That no equipment, including trailers, be located within the 10' rear yard setback requirement.

Ms. McBride asked if they have complied with any of the other requirements. **Mr. Drury** replied not yet, but they have submitted plans that show they are planning to implement the requirements.

Mr. Elliff stated that the photos submitted in the powerpoint vs the packet do not match and asked which is the final design. **Mr. Drury** replied that they would need to ask the applicant.

Mark Quinn, 3628 Oxford Court, Erlanger Kentucky, stated that the two post canopy with metal posts and a canvas top is what is proposed for the Beechmont location. He stated that this is the same across the company, the only difference with the one in Milford is that it is a four post. He stated that they are waiting on a decision on the canopy in order to implement the rest of the items. He provided reasons for the canopy including the benefits to the customers and the employees. He stated that the canvas material is non-negotiable, he stated that they will remove the asphalt, and will not do the dumpster enclosure, landscaping and will not allow the sidewalk unless they can do the canopy.

Ms. Ward asked if this is a standard design across U-Haul. **Mr. Quinn** replied that yes, there are varying sizes and it can be 20x20 or 20x40.

Ms. Ward asked how the longevity is of the canopy. **Mr. Quinn** replied that it depends on how bad storms are, but they are prepared to replace it if it needs to be.

Ms. Ward asked if they are comfortable with the maintenance. **Mr. Quinn** replied that yes, they are not that expensive and can be replaced when torn.

Ms. McBride asked if this location is the only place on the site where the canopy can go. **Mr. Quinn** replied that he tried to fit it on the side and it would interfere with where propane is located and cause bottlenecking with customer flow.

Ms. McBride asked how tall it is. **Mr. Quinn** replied that it is 18-20' high.

Ms. McBride asked if there are lights underneath the canopy. **Mr. Quinn** replied yes, there are lights to illuminate it.

Ms. McBride asked about run off. **Mr. Quinn** replied that it comes right off the side and is waterproof. **Ms. McBride** asked if it is like a boat canvas. **Mr. Quinn** replied yes, it is similar.

Ms. McBride asked how this is proposed to be anchored. **Mr. Quinn** replied that they do have an engineer for installation who strategically anchors it to the ground.

Mr. Elliff stated that the four post almost looks like a tent and the two post looks way more substantial. **Mr. Quinn** replied that the four post has more anchor points and can be smaller posts.

Mr. Elliff asked if you stood on the proposed sidewalk, would you be able to tell that it is canvas. **Mr. Quinn** replied that you would not be able to tell.

Mr. Brewer asked if the applicant looked at standing metal seam. **Mr. Quinn** replied no, because it was immediately shot down.

Mr. Gothard referred to a submittal image and asked if it would be better maintained. **Mr. Quinn** replied that he would definitely take better care of the paint and overall maintenance.

Mr. Gothard asked how quickly a canvas top can be replaced. **Mr. Quinn** replied that in a minimum of 7 days to completely replace it.

The public hearing was closed at 6:01 PM.

DECISION

Mr. Brewer moved, Ms. Ward seconded to approve Case 1-2025 PUD Major Adjustment for the property of 8210 Beechmont Avenue, also known as U-Haul, to remove Condition #6 based on staff's findings and recommendations and, with the other conditions to remain. 2 Yeas- Brewer, Ward; 3 Nos- Elliff, McBride, Gothard

CASE 1-2020 PUD MAJOR ADJUSTMENT

Mr. Drury stated that this is a quasi-judicial hearing for Case 1-2020 PUD Major Adjustment and read the staff report for an application filed by Joshua Blatt, Member of Hickory Woods Development Company, LLC, on behalf of Clous Anderson LLC, property owner, located at 1240 Nagel Road (Book 500, Page 121, Parcel 158), zoned "E-PUD" Retail Planned Unit Development.

Mr. Drury stated that the applicant is requesting a Major Adjustment to the approved Planned Unit Development in Case 1-2020 PUD in order to construct a 70-unit apartment complex. The applicant is proposing 38 one-bedroom units and 32 two-bedroom units for a total density of 28.76 units per acre. The applicant is proposing 121 parking spaces, and landscaping. The proposed impervious surface ratio is 79.9%.

Mr. Drury stated that the Zoning Commission is reviewing the application because the proposed development will have an impervious surface ratio greater than 60%, which triggers the PUD overlay and the standards found in Article 4.1 of the Zoning Resolution. The existing ISR of the site is 58.2% and the applicant is proposing an increase in the ISR to 79.9%.

Mr. Drury stated the tract is 2.475 acres, with approximately 240' of frontage on Nagel Road, the topography is relatively flat and the existing use is vacant land, used as overflow car dealership parking.

Mr. Drury stated that the applicant is proposing to construct an apartment building with 70 units, including 38 one bedroom units and 32 two bedroom units, for a total density of 28.76 units/acre. The footprint of the proposed building is 21,147 square feet. The building is proposed to be four stories, for a total of approximately 84,588 square feet. Based on feedback from the December Zoning Commission meeting, the applicant shifted the building back from Nagel Road to accommodate future dedicated right-of-way, therefore eliminating 6 parking spaces and is providing a total of 121 parking spaces, cross access to adjacent properties, landscaping, parking lot lighting, an outdoor amenity area, a dumpster enclosure and an overall impervious surface ratio of 79.9%. (The impervious surface ratio on the previously submitted plans was 83.3%).

Mr. Drury stated that the five former office buildings were constructed in 1982.

Mr. Drury stated that an addition to the pole sign (located on Beechmont, adjacent to the driveway accessing Anderson Pub and Grill and retail center) was approved in 1989, size 8' x 17', 6". In 1990 the existing free-standing sign was approved for alterations, size 6' x 17', 6". From 1989-2000 various permits for face changes to the existing pole sign were approved. This pole sign, while advertising the office buildings, was not located on that parcel.

Mr. Drury stated that the five former office buildings were demolished in 2018. New addresses were assigned in 2020; from 8070 Beechmont Avenue to 1240 Nagel Road for Lot #1 and 1246 Nagel Road for Lot #2. (They have since been consolidated into one lot with the address of 1240 Nagel Road).

Mr. Drury stated that Case 1-2020 PUD was approved by the Zoning Commission on February 24, 2020, for the construction of a 10,000 SF Medical Office Building on Lot #1 and an 11,775 SF Day Care with an outdoor playground on Lot #2. The approval also included a 20' panhandle connecting to Nagel Road, 82 parking spaces, an ISR of 64% and a landscaping plan compliant with the Anderson Township Zoning Resolution. It was never constructed and has been used as overflow parking for adjacent businesses.

Mr. Drury stated that the Zoning Commission heard Case 1-2020 PUD Major Adjustment for Carriage Carwash on May 22, 2023. The Zoning Commission moved "to continue Case 1-2020 PUD Major Adjustment, for the property located at 1240 and 1246 Nagel Road with the public hearing in progress for additional information from the applicant and compliance with the

Zoning Resolution.”

Mr. Drury stated that on June 26, 2023, the Zoning Commission approved Case 1-2020 PUD Major Adjustment for Carriage Carwash, with four conditions including: 1. The property of 1240 and 1246 Nagel shall be limited to the proposed free standing signage on Nagel Road, with a maximum height of 10’. No additional freestanding signage shall be permitted for this property. 2. That a lighting plan in compliance with the Anderson Township Zoning Resolution shall be submitted for approval, and the lights shall dim 30 minutes after closing. 3. That the submitted plans be revised to provide an ISR calculation. 4. That the proposed CMU material shall be an integral color. The car wash was also never constructed.

Mr. Drury stated that at the December 15, 2025 Zoning Commission hearing, the Zoning Commission moved to continue the case with the request of additional information regarding the following:

- A recommendation from the Hamilton County Engineer including details on what will need to be included in the traffic study.
- An updated landscaping plan to provide additional screening to adjacent properties.
- Consideration of a different building placement on the site, outdoor amenities, and a reduction in height.

In response to the motion to continue, the applicant resubmitted their plans with the following items highlighted:

- The building has been moved 20’ to the east, away from Nagel Road due to the potential for the dedication of additional right-of-way.
- The addition of landscaping materials to all sides of the building, including emphasis on the property line adjacent to the Goddard School.
- An outdoor amenity area.
- A light plan in compliance with the Zoning Resolution.
- A dumpster enclosure detail.
- A cross section showing site lines from the upper balconies to the Goddard School.

Zoning Resolution Compliance

The proposed development is **non-compliant** with the following articles of the Anderson Township Zoning Resolution:

Article 3.14, C, 1- Height Regulations: No building shall exceed three (3) stories or forty-five (45) feet in height.

The applicant is proposing a 4 story building, 52' from the average grade to the highest parapet.

Article 3.14, C, 2, d, ii- Intensity of Use: Every lot of tract of land on which there is erected a two-family dwelling or a multiple dwelling shall have a minimum width of fifty (50) feet at the building line and an area of not less than three thousand (3,000) square feet per family, except that the area regulation shall not apply to dormitories, fraternities, or sororities where no cooking is done in individual rooms or apartments. Every lot on which there is erected a building for any other use permitted in "D" Residence District shall have a minimum width of sixty (60) feet and a minimum area of ten thousand (10,000) square feet. **The applicant is proposing 70 units total, which is a density of 28.28 units per acre, whereas the underlying "E" Zoning District allows for 14.52 units per acre. With a site total of 2.475 acres, the applicant would be permitted 35 units by right.**

Article 5.3, D, 2, d - d. All parking spaces shall be entered and exited along parking aisles arranged perpendicular to access drives or aisles to the maximum extent feasible. Parking spaces shall not be located along entry drives within thirty (30) feet of the right-of-way. **Parking spaces off the northern entrance are setback 25' vs the required 30'.**

Mr. Drury stated that in addition to compliance with the Township's Zoning Resolution, the development is also being reviewed in light of adopted plans for this area, such as the Anderson Plan, the Anderson Trails and Walkways Plan, and the Anderson Township Design Guidelines.

Mr. Drury stated that the proposal is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Anderson Plan and its recommendations for enhancing economic activities. The Future Land Use classification identifies the site for General Mixed Use, which is defined as "Community and regional oriented businesses, offices, and services that are located primarily along major thoroughfares. These uses may be located in individual-user buildings, multi-tenant buildings, or mixed-use buildings. Buildings are encouraged to be located close to the road with the majority of parking located to the side and rear of buildings. Residential uses may be located in mixed-use buildings but should only be located on the second floors or higher or behind nonresidential buildings." **While the proposed development does not contain a retail development, there are multiple businesses in front of the proposal that face Beechmont Avenue. In addition, the applicant is providing access into the shopping centers, creating connections between the residential and commercial aspects of the greater area.**

The application is consistent with the following Goals of the Anderson Plan:

Land Use and Development: Anderson Township will be a well-planned community with a

mixture of parks, recreational uses, residential neighborhoods, commercial centers and an industrial base balanced with agricultural uses. **The proposal of apartment units located just off of Beechmont Avenue will allow for a connection between retail and residential uses. In addition, it creates a residential transition from the business district along Beechmont Avenue to lower intensity commercial and single family residential on Nagel Road.**

Land Use and Development Initiatives:

7.2.1 Protect single family neighborhoods from higher intensity uses by implementing landscape buffers or the development of transitional uses. **In response to comments made at the December 15, 2025 Zoning Commission hearing, the applicant shifted the building back 20 additional feet off of Nagel Road. In addition, they have increased the landscaping buffer between the adjacent uses and this property.**

7.3.3 Incorporate residential uses within the Beechmont corridor, to help provide the critical mass of population needed to support local and regional businesses in the Township. **This property is located right behind a restaurant and shopping center, as well as being adjacent to a shopping center.**

Anderson Trails Plan

Beechmont Sidewalks: There are existing sidewalks along the frontage of the site on Nagel Road that connect to sidewalks on Beechmont Avenue. There are also interior sidewalks around the site.

Design Guidelines

The proposal is consistent with the following elements of the Anderson Design Guidelines:

Site Planning: Upgrading visual character and sense of human scale in spaces through particular attention to architecture, site planning, signage, landscaping, and lighting.

Landscaping: Incorporate appropriate plantings that are in scale with their surroundings.

Architecture: Building design should be developed to a human scale through careful consideration of architectural forms, massing, detailing, number and use of materials, and color. The proposed building contains a mixture of building materials, on all sides. The building is proposed to have parapets at varying heights to add visual detail.

Pedestrian Circulation: Connections to the public sidewalk are included in the redevelopment of this site.

Mr. Drury stated that staff recommends approval based on the Planned Unit Development evaluation criteria (Article 4.1, G):

Mr. Drury stated that if approved, staff recommends the following conditions from the previous resolution remain:

1. The proposed apartment building is consistent with underlying zoning district of "E" Retail Business.
 2. The application is consistent with the Vision and Goals of the Board of Trustees as outlined in the adopted Anderson Plan. The application is consistent with the following Goals of the Anderson Plan as outlined above.
 3. The use of an apartment building is compatible with surrounding retail uses.
 4. The size and physical features of the project area enable adequate protection of surrounding property and orderly and coordinated improvement of property in the vicinity of the site.
 5. A timeline of construction was not submitted with the application.
 6. The applicant is currently in conversations with MSD regarding sewer capacity.
 7. There are no scenic or historical features, as identified or contained in plans duly adopted by the Anderson Township Board of Township Trustees and Hamilton County Regional Planning Commission, which would not be conserved.
 8. Certain modifications of the zoning regulations may be warranted, such as the height of the building and density, given the proximity to Beechmont Avenue.
 9. The adequacy of the proposed pedestrian circulation system insulates pedestrian circulation from vehicular movement.
 10. The adequacy of the provisions for visual and acoustical privacy. The applicant is proposing a landscaping buffer to the north, and is adjacent to commercial and office to the east and south.
 11. The development does not include dedicated open space.
 12. The development will not be detrimental to the present and potential surrounding uses.
 13. The applicant is communicating with the Hamilton County Engineer's Office to determine what will be required. In addition, a stormwater detention will be provided underground. The applicant is also working with MSD on sewer availability.
 14. The development is consistent with the Vision and Goals as adopted by the Anderson Township Board of Trustees.
 15. The site does not contain land over 20% slope and is not located in the floodplain.
- Mr. Drury stated that if approved, staff recommends the following conditions:
 1. Bike racks should be added in a strategic location to serve residents and visitors to the site.

2. Approval from the Hamilton County Engineers Office on any roadway / access improvements shall be received prior to issuance of a zoning certificate.

Mr. Elliff asked to confirm that the revisions submitted met everything that was needed from the last meeting besides the information from the County Engineer. **Mr. Drury** replied yes, they felt like they complied with everything that they could.

Ms. McBride asked for two clarifications within the staff report, including the ISR. **Mr. Drury** replied that the correct ISR is 79.9%.

Mr. Gothard asked if more information has been given on the storage barn access for Goddard. **Mr. Drury** replied yes, they did stripe spaces so that Goddard will have access.

Josh Blatt, John Henry Homes, applicant, stated they have participated in several multi family projects across Cincinnati, including Loveland Station and Mason Oaks. He stated that they are locally owned and continue to own everything that they build. He added that they have zero intention on selling anything that they build. He stated that these are luxury market rate apartments and not subsidized housing. He stated that they are currently working on the Anderson Grove project and should have a model available next month. He stated that their engineer and architect are here as well. He stated that the site on Nagel is an anomaly and is incredibly difficult to build it. He stated that the previous commercial proposal of a car wash was not going to ultimately be profitable and they think that they have the best use for the property. He stated that their target tenant is the person coming from a house to an apartment, with the added amenities of a walkable Beechmont Avenue. He discussed the additional information requested during the last Zoning Commission meeting and stated that they have retained a traffic consultant and are looking at the requirements from the County and due to cost, will be waiting until they have approval from Zoning Commission to move forward. He stated that they will incorporate everything that is recommended from it.

Ms. McBride stated that she appreciates the effort to retain the traffic engineer, the added amenities, and landscaping. She stated that in terms of the height, the majority over the requirement is parapet and she would rather a building be slightly taller to hide the AC units.

Mr. Brewer stated that he really appreciates and commends the applicant for really taking to consideration the comments of both the Zoning Commission and surrounding residents.

Mr. Gothard echoed the comments from the other commissioners and stated that it really says a lot about their dedication to the Township and their project.

Tony Ravagnani, 1641 Pinebluff, stated that he is a resident, but also part of the team as an applicant. He stated that he has lived in the Township for 29 years and has hoped to see this site turn into something that is better for the community. He stated that he has done work for the Goddard school and other commercial properties, as well as residential projects around the Township. He stated that he truly believes this is the best use for this site. He stated that it will benefit the commercial community along Beechmont Avenue, with increased walkability. He stated that they took the Zoning Commission comments seriously and as his kids went to Goddard, he took the privacy of the students and the playground seriously.

Caitlyn Howe, 8138 Pineterrace Drive, stated that she has three children, and is concerned about 70 new drivers being added to the intersection of Nagel and Beechmont. She stated that this applicant is adding traffic to Eight Mile and Beechmont and now is proposing this, which is wildly irresponsible. She stated that the applicant has not stated if this is rental or ownership. She stated that she's assuming this is rental and that those people will not care about Anderson Township and do not pay taxes. She stated that this is just additional congestion that this just does not make sense. She stated that the ones Zicka is putting in across from Pineterrace are ridiculously priced at over 600,000 for a one bedroom. She stated that they are claiming that it is two bedroom, but it can't be counted as that because it is in the basement. She stated with Nagel Middle School, they have a hard enough time getting out of Pineterrace. She is concerned about the students walking to Beechmont Avenue getting to Canes and DQ. She stated that she was so excited for Vantage to go in because she thought it was going to be owner occupied, but it is completely rental units and not entirely filled so this doesn't make any sense.

Steve Wood, 8109 Pineterrace Drive, stated that regarding that site, it has only been open since 2018 and would love to see something go in there but is not sure why they are shoehorning this many units into this site. He stated that the intersection of Beechmont and Nagel is a cluster and APG's entrance and Tide's entrance are the main causes to the wrecks. He stated that we need to be smart about traffic plans. He asked about where the sidewalk ends and that it needs to be continued up to Beechmont Avenue.

Shawn Anderson, 8067 Pineterrace Drive, stated that he would reiterate what his neighbors have said but also would like to add that with the average grade, it is at least 57 feet high on the one side. He stated that this is just going to be a giant wall between Beechmont and residential and thinks the density and height need to be discussed further. He stated that he believes that this is too much.

Josh Blatt, applicant, stated that there is an existing sidewalk along Nagel, so it will be remaining. He stated that the comment on them not caring is inaccurate. He stated that there

is a portion of the population that likes the aspect of not owning anything. He stated that's why there is a push for luxury rental property. He stated that they would not be able to get the rents and stay occupied if they did not take great care of their property. He stated that they are committed to the Township and want to provide a product that goes with the Comprehensive Plan.

Tony Ravagnani, on behalf of the applicant, explained the average height calculation.

The public hearing was closed at 7:07 PM.

DECISION

Ms. McBride Moved, Mr. Elliff seconded to approve Case 1-2020 PUD Major Adjustment for the property of 1240 Nagel Road, also known as Nagel Road Apartments, based on staff's findings and recommendations and in compliance with adopted plans, with the following conditions presented in the staff report.

4 Yeas, 1 No- Ms. Ward

CASE 1-2025 LUP

Mr. Drury stated that this is a public hearing for Case 1-2025 LUP and read the staff report for an application filed by the Anderson Township Planning and Zoning staff on behalf of the Board of Township Trustees.

Mr. Drury stated that the applicant is requesting recommendation to the Anderson Township Board of Trustees for approval of amendments to Articles 2.10, 5.5, and 6.1 of the Anderson Township Zoning Resolution, and correcting formatting and spelling errors that have been found ever since the Zoning Resolution was reformatted in 2016.

Mr. Drury stated that adoption of the Resolution was initiated by the Board of Township Trustees on October 16, 2025. Hamilton County Regional Planning Commission heard the request on December 4, 2025 and recommended approval of the text amendments. A copy of the Hamilton County staff report and minutes are attached.

Mr. Drury stated that Anderson Township adopted the existing Zoning Resolution in 1988. While components of the document date back to 1948 from the original Hamilton County Resolution, various text amendments and updates have been made over the years. In March 2015, the Zoning Resolution was reformatted for simplicity of use and provides illustrations.

The most recent text amendments to the Zoning Resolution occurred in 2024:

- Multi-family Residence Districts - remove the minimum of 1 acre requirement for rest homes, convalescent homes, day care center, nursery school, prekindergarten, kindergarten, or similar private schools and add single-family residence district conditional uses to the multi-family residence district.
- Planned Unit Development Overlay - permit the Zoning Commission to increase the density of a residential development in the "E" Retail zoning district only, greater than the underlying density requirements in the "E" zoning district.
- Short Term Rentals – remove two conditions – 1. requiring parking outside the front yard setback and requiring an emergency response plan.
- Decks - require a minimum of a 5' setback to the rear property line.
- Office Zoning Districts - adding "Day Care Centers" as a permitted use in the "O" Office zoning district.

Mr. Drury stated that research was conducted earlier this year through a CLG survey and CLOUT to see trends in Ohio communities, as well as through the American Planning Association (APA) for national trends. The proposed amendments have also been reviewed by Township Legal Counsel.

Mr. Drury provided summaries of each exhibit.

Mr. Elliff stated that this was a great effort on the reformatting and asked if paragraph C of Article 2.10 is correct. **Mr. Drury** replied that it is correct.

Mr. Elliff asked if the light intensity only applied to lights in window. **Mr. Drury** replied that there is already language in the Zoning Resolution for intensity of monument signs so this is mainly for the bright LED lights in store windows.

Mr. Elliff asked if the temporary sign regulations also apply to the commercial zoning district too. **Mr. Drury** replied that you can have up to 16 sq. ft. in a commercial zoning district without permit, in residential it is anything up to 8 sq. ft. and will apply to both. **Mr. Elliff** added that he thinks it would be beneficial to leave the time frame up for the commercial zoning district in order to avoid sign clutter.

Ms. McBride stated that she agrees with **Mr. Elliff** but if staff can't keep track of the time frame, how do they enforce it and is it selective zoning. **Mr. Elliff** replied if it was complaint based, staff could note the sign and then enforce a time frame.

The public hearing was closed at 7:44PM.

DECISION

Ms. Ward moved, Ms. McBride seconded to approve Case 1-2025 LUP to the Anderson Township Board of Trustees, based on staff's findings and recommendations as presented.

A unanimous vote was taken.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Ms. McBride moved, Mr. Elliff seconded to nominate Mr. Gothard as the chair for the 2026 Zoning Commission.

4 Yeas, 1 No- Mr. Gothard

Ms. McBride moved, Mr. Gothard seconded to nominate Mr. Elliff as the vice chair for the 2026 Zoning Commission.

A unanimous vote was taken

Ms. McBride recused herself for the next Case.

CASE 1-2026 PUD

Mr. Drury stated that this is a quasi-judicial hearing for a Planned Unit Development request for Case 1-2026 PUD and read the staff report for an application filed Macy Downey of McBride Dale Clarion, on behalf of 7-Eleven, on behalf of EMRO Marketing Co and Speedway LLC, property owners, located at 8342 and 8352 Beechmont Avenue (Book 500, Page 41, Parcels 237 and 230), zoned "E" Retail Business.

Mr. Drury stated that the applicant is requesting a Planned Unit Development (PUD) approval for the proposed demolition and reconstruction of a Speedway Fuel and Convenience Store, size 4,746 SF, a new fueling station with six double sided fuel dispensers, signage and landscaping with an impervious surface ratio of 75% down from the previous 90%.

Mr. Drury stated that the Zoning Commission is reviewing the application because the proposed development will have an Impervious Surface Ratio (ISR) greater than 60%, which triggers the PUD overlay and the standards found in Article 4.1 of the Zoning Resolution. The proposed impervious surface ratio is 75%.

Mr. Drury stated the 8342 Beechmont is 0.892 acres, and 8352 Beechmont is 0.884 acres with approximately 298' of frontage on Beechmont Avenue and 221' on Eight Mile Road, the topography is relatively flat and the existing use is Speedway/former McCall's Flooring site.

Mr. Drury stated that the applicant is proposing to demolish the existing buildings on the site, Speedway and the former McCall's Flooring, and construct a Speedway Fuel and Convenience Store, size 4,746 SF with six double sided fuel pumps and canopy. Full access is proposed on Eight Mile Road as well as on Beechmont Avenue with a cross-access easement proposed to the west. The development will contain landscaping, a dumpster and signage. A building material mixture of EIFS, corrugated metal, and fiber cement panels are proposed. In coordination with the project, Anderson Township is proposing the construction of a right-turn lane on Eight Mile Road. This project is being coordinated with the property owner, Hamilton County Engineer's Office, and the Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT).

Mr. Drury stated that the existing Speedway structure was constructed in 1991. The McCall's building was built in 1900 with a subsequent addition in 1999. The McCall's property was transferred to Speedway in 2021 and is currently vacant.

Zoning Resolution Compliance

The proposed development is **non-compliant** with the following articles of the Anderson Township Zoning Resolution:

Article 5.3, D, 1, e: No part of a parking area for five (5) vehicles or more shall be closer than ten (10) feet from the property line adjacent to the residence district or property devoted to residential use. The applicant proposes a parking setback of 7'-4" where 10' is required when abutting a residential use. (Cherry St.)

Article 5.3 L, 5, b, i: A minimum of one (1) shade or evergreen tree per thirty (30) lineal feet of parking surface frontage and one (1) shrub per ten (10) lineal feet of parking surface frontage shall be planted along the perimeter of any parking area adjacent to all dedicated streets.

The applicant proposes 5 shade trees along Eight Mile Road where 7 are required. In addition, the applicant proposes ornamental trees along Beechmont Ave where shade or evergreen trees are required.

Article 5.3 L, 5, b, ii: For parking areas adjacent to a side or rear lot line of a residence district or property devoted to a residential use, a minimum of one (1) evergreen or shade tree per 30 lineal feet of parking surfaces and one (1) shrub per five (5) lineal feet of parking surfaces shall be planted along the perimeter of the parking area. The applicant proposes to relocate

required evergreen trees along the north rear lot line to the west side lot line.

Article 5.3 L, 6, a: Parking lot Interior Landscaping- Applicability: All parking lots with twenty (20) or more parking spaces shall comply with these interior parking lot landscaping requirements. Landscaping used to fulfill the perimeter parking lot landscaping requirements as outlined in Article 5.3, L, 4 shall not be considered for products of satisfying these interior parking lot landscaping requirements. The applicant proposes internal plantings be located along western property line.

Article 5.3, K: Lighting for Non-Single Family Uses: A lighting plan was not submitted in compliance with the Anderson Township Zoning Resolution.

Article 5.5 G, 4, c: Maximum height shall not be more than three (3) feet above finished grade level of the adjoining pavement surface. The applicant proposes directional signs at a height of 5 ft where 3 ft is permitted.

Article 5.5 G, 6, d: Minimum front yard setback of sign is the same setback as building regulations provided for permitted building in the district in which the sign is located. No leading edge of any sign shall be closer than fifty (50) feet to a residential district. The two large off premise signs are located closer than 50 feet to a residential district. One is on the property line adjacent to a residential district.

Article 5.5, G, 6, f: Minimum distance between off-premise advertising signs measured by radius from all existing off-premise signs wherever located is 500 radial feet. The two off premise signs on the properties are less than 300 feet from each other.

Article 5.5, G, 6, h: Minimum side and rear yard setbacks of leading edge of sign to nearest property line is fifteen (15) feet (except that no leading edge shall be closer than fifty feet to a residential zone). One of the off premise signs is located on the property line adjacent to a residential zone.

General Plan Notes:

- Plan shall include setback distances for all buildings and canopy to the property and R/W lines.
- Plan shall include an identified loading zone.
- A surveyor stamped site plan is required for the issuance of a zoning certificate.

Mr. Drury stated that in addition to compliance with the Township's Zoning Resolution, the development is also being reviewed in light of adopted plans for this area, such as the Anderson

Plan, the Anderson Trails and Walkways Plan, and the Anderson Township Design Guidelines.

The proposal is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Anderson Plan and its recommendations for enhancing economic activities. The Future Land Use classification identifies the site for General Mixed Use, which is defined as "Community and regional oriented businesses, offices, and services that are located primarily along major thoroughfares. These uses may be located in individual-user buildings, multi-tenant buildings, or mixed-use buildings. Buildings are encouraged to be located close to the road with the majority of parking located to the side and rear of buildings. Residential uses may be located in mixed-use buildings but should only be located on the second floors or higher or behind nonresidential buildings." The proposed use meets this description.

The application is consistent with the following Goals of the Anderson Plan:

Economic Vitality: The Township should attract a variety of businesses to meet changing demographics and market demands. With a focus on an expanded tax base with an increasing amount of land developed for a mixture of non-residential uses.

Land Use and Development: Anderson Township will be a well-planned community with a mixture of parks, recreational uses, residential neighborhoods, commercial centers and an industrial base balanced with agricultural uses.

Land Use and Development: The Beechmont Corridor will be a viable and attractive destination for residents, as well as a regional destination for Greater Cincinnati.

Beechmont Plan

The site is located in Neighborhood 5 which encourages the following:

- Facades that identify individual tenant spaces
- Substantial, quality building material
- Parking lot connections between neighboring properties and service drives behind properties
- Restricting / closing unnecessary driveways
- Landscape between sidewalk and parking areas
- Landscape areas and trees within parking lots

The proposal is consistent with the following elements of the Beechmont Plan:

Restricting/closing unnecessary driveways: Reducing turning conflicts is an important element in improving traffic flow and safety along Beechmont Avenue. The applicant is reducing curb

cuts on Beechmont Avenue from 3 to 1 full access. The applicant is also reducing curb cuts on Eight Mile Road from 2 to 1.

Develop Cross Access: The ability to provide access between adjacent parcels is a critical element in improving traffic flow along Beechmont Avenue. The applicant is identifying cross access to the property to the west.

Design Guidelines

The proposal is consistent with the following elements of the Anderson Design Guidelines:

Landscaping: Incorporate appropriate plantings that are in scale with their surroundings. Separate roadways from commercial development by attractive landscape planter strips.

The proposal is not consistent with the following elements of the Anderson Design Guidelines: Architecture: The use of EIFS as a primary material is discouraged. The Design Guidelines state that EIFS may be used in some instances, and with proper maintenance, be an acceptable secondary material. Additionally the building uses sustainable amounts of fastener corrugated metal panels which is highly reflective the use of such materials is discouraged in the Design Guidelines.

Signage: The Design Guideline state that freestanding signage is encouraged to be erected at lower heights, maintaining clearance above landscaping and parked automobiles, and below power lines and mature trees. Additionally, it is recommended that freestanding signage be ground mounted as opposed to pole signs.

Mr. Drury stated that staff recommends approval based on the Planned Unit Development evaluation criteria (Article 4.1, G):

1. The proposed fueling center development is consistent with the "E" Retail District. The PUD Plan is compliant with the Zoning Resolution except for the requested variances, **Article 5.3, D, 1, e, Article 5.3 L, 5, b, i, Article 5.3 L, 5, b, ii, Article 5.3 L, 6, Article 5.3, K and Article 5.5 G, 4, c.**
2. The application is consistent with the Vision and Goals of the Board of Trustees as outlined in the adopted Anderson Plan. The application is consistent with the following

Goals of the Anderson Plan as outlined above:

Economic Vitality: The Township should attract a variety of businesses to meet changing demographics and market demands. With a focus on an expanded tax base with an increasing

amount of land developed for a mixture of non-residential uses, this will attract new businesses and promote and retain existing businesses.

Land Use and Development: Anderson Township will be a well-planned community with a mixture of parks, recreational uses, residential neighborhoods, commercial centers and an industrial base balanced with agricultural uses.

Land Use and Development: The Beechmont Corridor will be a viable and attractive destination for residents, as well as a regional destination for Greater Cincinnati.

3. The use (fueling center & convenience store) is compatible with surrounding retail land uses.
4. The size and physical features of the project area enable adequate protection of surrounding property and orderly and coordinated improvement of property in the vicinity of the site.
5. No proposed phasing was submitted.
6. The proposed development is serviced adequately and efficiently by essential public facilities and services, which are in existence on Beechmont Avenue.
7. There are no scenic or historical features, as identified or contained in plans duly adopted by the Anderson Township Board of Township Trustees and Hamilton County Regional Planning Commission, which would not be conserved.
8. Certain modifications of the zoning regulations may be warranted such as the reduced buffer to the side yard residential area.
9. The proposed pedestrian circulation system should insulate pedestrian circulation from vehicular movement, if modifications are made to identify pedestrian access from Beechmont, and relocate pedestrian access from Eight Mile to not conflict with the landscape island.
10. The plan provides adequate visual and acoustic privacy.
11. The development does not include dedicated open space, other than the required parking lot landscaping.
12. The development will not be detrimental to the present and potential surrounding uses.
13. The development is consistent with recommendations from Township, County, State and/or Federal agencies. The applicant did not provide information regarding stormwater detention.
14. The development is consistent with the Vision and Goals as adopted by the Anderson Township Board of Trustees. However, the two off-premise business signs are nonconforming due to their installation prior to the current sign regulations, and noncompliance with Articles 5.5, G, 6, d, f, & h. During redevelopment of properties,

property owners have been encouraged to bring nonconforming aspects of the property in compliance, or consistent with adopted Township plans.

15. The plan adequately protects natural features.

Mr. Drury stated that staff recommends variances from the following articles of the Zoning Resolution:

Article 5.3, D, 1, e To allow a parking setback of 7' 4" where 10' is required when abutting a residential use.

Article 5.3 L, 5, b, i To allow 5 shade trees along Eight Mile Rd where 7 are required and to allow ornamental trees along Beechmont Ave where shade or evergreen trees are required.

Article 5.3 L, 5, b, ii To allow to put evergreen trees required on north rear lot line on side west lot line.

Article 5.3 L, 6 To allow internal plantings be located along western property line.

Staff **does not** recommend a variance from the following:

Article 5.5 G, 4, c: To allow directional signs at a height of 5 ft where 3 ft is permitted.

Mr. Drury stated that if approved, staff recommends the following conditions:

1. That the directional signage be brought into compliance with the ATZR Article 5.5, G, 4.
2. That a lighting plan in compliance with ATZR Article 5.3, K shall be submitted for approval.
3. That the proposed freestanding sign be modified to be a monument sign, consistent with the Township Design Guidelines.
4. That the pedestrian access be modified to include an access for pedestrians off of Beechmont and modified so that the access from Eight Mile does not dead end into a landscape island.
5. That an easement be granted to the Township to facilitate improvements for the right turn lane and decorative stone wall relocation.
6. That building materials be brought in line with Anderson Township Design Guidelines.
7. That the off-premise advertising sign shall be removed no later than 30 days after the current lease expires in compliance with Article 5.5, G, 6 of the ATZR.

Ms. Ward asked for confirmation on the location of the privacy style fence. **Mr. Drury** described the location.

Mr. Elliff asked for additional information about striping connection to Beechmont Avenue.

Mr. Elliff asked if the mulch sales along Beechmont Avenue is allowed. **Mr. Drury** replied that he would look into it.

Mr. Elliff stated that while this doesn't meet the Design Guidelines, it seems like it is their new modern take on the gas station design so what do we need to make it match the Design Guidelines. **Mr. Drury** replied that staff's main concern is over the use of EIFS on the building.

Mr. Elliff asked if we have precedent on the removal of the billboard. **Mr. Drury** replied that there was one at Krispy Kreme and one at the Legion that were conditioned to be removed at the end of the lease and were successfully removed.

Mr. Gothard asked if the condition of removal includes both billboards. **Mr. Drury** replied yes.

Macy Downey, McBride Dale Clarion, applicant on behalf of 7/11 Speedway, walked through the variance request and stated what has worked well for Speedway and why they are requesting them. She stated the directional signs were requested for a 2' variance because that is what works best for Speedway in terms of being visible over bushes and shrubs. She stated that they are fine with making it look a bit more like a monument style design but would like to maintain 15' in height. She stated that they will make sure that the sidewalk does not end in the landscaping bed. She stated that they would like to request further consideration of the proposed design of the building and that while they are using EIFS, they are combining it with other materials and it is a substantially better option than what is currently there. She stated that the billboards are additional income for Speedway, however, they are ok with complying with the condition that they be removed.

Mr. Elliff asked if the columns on the canopy could be wrapped with a masonry finish. **Ms. Downey** replied that they aren't proposed here but they have done it elsewhere so I don't think it would be a big concern.

Mr. Elliff asked about the outdoor sale of mulch and additional items. **Ms. Downey** replied that their plan calls for propane and ice dispensers, but normally the plans don't call for the more seasonal sales. **Mr. Drury** added that he has been searching the Zoning Resolution and has not found anything and staff has typically not enforced it.

Mr. Elliff asked what kind of lighting will be installed. **Ms. Downey** replied that they are working on updating the lighting plan to match the Zoning Resolution requirements and that

they will be shielded down.

Mr. Elliff asked if the privacy style fence would be oriented for the finished side facing inward or outward. **Ms. Downey** replied that she believes it will be post side in.

Mr. Elliff asked where stormwater will be located. **Ms. Downey** replied that they have not gotten into the technical aspects of the drawings yet.

Mr. Elliff asked if the gas price will be on the canopy as well. **Ms. Downey** replied no.

Mr. Brewer reconfirmed that Speedway will be ok removing the billboards as conditioned.

Mr. Gothard asked if Speedway would consider moving the air pump over by the dumpster. **Ms. Downey** replied that she believed it could be considered and is not sure that it was considered. She added her only concern would be if someone is parked there while the dumpster is trying to be cleared.

Mr. Gothard asked for clarification on what the label for F3 is. **Ms. Downey** replied that it is the fence.

Mr. Gothard asked if the fence will be the natural material color or if it will be painted. He asked if Speedway would consider a PVC material fence instead of a natural fence in order to last longer.

Mr. Gothard asked about the pedestrian access from Beechmont and if it could run back towards the dumpster. **Ms. Downey** replied yes, they will take a look at that.

Mr. Gothard asked if Right of Way will be dedicated. **Ms. Downey** replied yes.

Mr. Gothard asked if they would consider adding evergreen trees around the dumpster in order to screen the dumpster from Beechmont Avenue. **Ms. Downey** replied yes, that she didn't see any reason why they couldn't do that.

Stewart Devitt, owner of the shopping center next door, stated that he wants to make sure that the new shrubs don't block folks exiting to the west. He is also worried about large trees going over the property line and not being able to get a lawn mower on his property to cut.

The public hearing was closed at 8:48 PM.

DECISION

Mr. Elliff Moved, Mr. Brewer seconded to approve Case 1-2026 PUD for the property of 8342 and 8352 Beechmont Avenue, also known as Speedway, based on staff's findings and recommendations and in accordance with adopted plans, with the following conditions 1-5 and 7 (removing #6) of the staff report and the additions of the following conditions: That the columns of the canopy be wrapped in stone or masonry, that the air pumps be moved to be closer to the dumpster, that the privacy fence be of vinyl construction, not wood, that pedestrian access to Beechmont be via paved sidewalk through western landscape area, that lighting be flat lens down design, that evergreens be subbed to screen the dumpster, and that the pole sign submitted not be approved and design be resubmitted to the Zoning Commission for consideration, this is to include approval of the variances for parking and landscaping modifications, not approval of the variance for the sign height.

A unanimous vote was taken.

The next regular meeting would be held on March 23, 2026, at 5:30 p.m. at Anderson Center. The meeting was adjourned at 9:01 PM.

Respectfully submitted,



Jonathan Gothard